

## ◆THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT◆

VOL. III.

MAY, 1884.

No. 9.

### THE DATE OF OBADIAH.

BY CHARLES ELLIOTT, D. D.,

London, Ontario.

The time of the prophet is a matter of dispute. The following dates have their respective advocates :

1. Hofmann, Delitzsch, Keil and Kleinert place him in the reign of Jehoram, between B. C. 889-884.
2. Caspari, Jaeger, Hengstenberg, Haevernick and others place him in the reign of Uzziah.
3. Vitringa, Carpzov, and Kueper, in the time of Ahaz.
4. Aben Ezra, Luther, Calovius, Michaelis, Schurrer, Bertheau, Holzapfel, and very many moderns place the date of the prophecy immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.
5. Hitzig and Eichhorn place it soon after 312 B. C.

The two elements available in solving the problem of its date are : (1) The allusions to the assault and capture of Jerusalem, and the maltreatment of its inhabitants ; and (2) the verbal coincidences with Joel, Amos, and Jeremiah.

The allusions to the capture of Jerusalem and the wicked conduct of the Edomites are found in vv. 10-14 of the book.

But Jerusalem was several times taken and plundered by its enemies, viz. : (1) by Shishak King of Egypt, in the fifth year of Rehoboam (1 Kings XIV., 25, 26 ; 2 Chron. XII., 2 sq.) ; (2) by the Philistines and Arabians in the time of Jehoram (2 Chron. XXI., 16, 17) ; (3) by Joash King of Israel in the reign of Amaziah (2 Kings, XIV., 13, 14 ; 2 Chron., XXV., 23, 24) ; (4) by the Chaldæans under Nebuchadnezzar, in the time of Jehoiakim, O. R. Hertwig's Tabellen, p. 54, (2 Kings XXIV., 1 sqq. ; 2 Chron. XXXVI., 6, 7) ; (5) by the Chaldæans again, in the reign of Jehoiachin (2 Kings XXIV., 10 sqq. ; 2 Chron. XXXVI., 10, (6) and finally destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, in the reign of Zedekiah (2 Kings XXV., sqq. ; 2 Chron. XXXVI., 17-19).

Of these different assaults and captures, the first can have no bearing upon the question before us, inasmuch as in the time of Rehoboam the Edomites were subject to the Kingdom of Judah, and could not have done what Obadiah says they did. It cannot be the conquest of Jerusalem by Jehoash, King of Israel, in the reign of Amaziah, King of Judah; for the prophet describes the enemies as *zarim* and *nokhrim* (strangers and foreigners), terms, which point to gentile nations (compare Joel III., 17; Lam. v., 2: Deut. XVII., 15), and cannot apply to the people of the ten tribes. There remain the captures of Jerusalem by the Philistines and Arabians, in the time of Jehoram, and by the Chaldæans, in the reigns of Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. To which of these does the prophet allude? The elements available, in solving the problem, as already stated, are (1) the allusions to the capture of the city; and (2) the verbal coincidences with Joel, Amos, and Jeremiah.

1. The allusions to the capture of Jerusalem (vv. 10-14), show that the Edomites took a malicious part in it; and that it was past, yet fresh in men's memories, when the prophet wrote. The expression, "for thy violence against thy brother Jacob" (v. 10), seems to refer to what was already past; so also the resolution of the infinitive construction into the preterite in the following instances: "In the day that thou stoodest; in the day that the strangers carried away captive his forces, and foreigners entered his gate, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, \* \* \* \* \* in the day that he became a stranger, in the day of their destruction (vv. 11, 12)."

These infinitive constructions do not determine the question; for they may refer, so far as grammar is concerned, to a future act, or event, as well as to one past (Lev. XXIII., 22). Yet the whole frame and texture of verses 10-14 indicate that the event was past; and in v. 15 the prophet uses the preterite and says: "As thou has done, it shall be done unto thee." In these verses he employs the language of detailed description, which is more appropriate to the past than to the future.

An objection to this view is found in the words אַל-תִּירָא, "look not," which, in our version, are rendered, "thou shouldst not have looked." Nordheimer (Heb. Gram. vol. II., sec. 1,065, 1) says: "Now as a dependent proposition of this sort can relate only to an action not yet performed, this particle (אַל) appears with no tense but the absolute future [in 1 Sam. XXVII., 10, it is found with the absolute past form], either in its full form, or as apocopated; and then it expresses an earnest deprecation." This is grammatically true. But we must not

forget the nature of prophetic speech, which depicts from eyesight. The scene is before the Seer, but whether in vision of the future, or in imagination of the past, there is nothing in the mere words to determine.

2. The verbal coincidences with Jeremiah, Joel, and Amos.

Bleek holds that Obadiah follows Jeremiah, and of course Joel.

Caspari and Haevernick maintain that Jeremiah follows Obadiah, and Obadiah Joel.

Ewald holds that Jeremiah and Obadiah follow and embody a former prophecy, probably posterior to Joel.

Hofmann, Delitzsch, and Kleinert assign him to the first period of written prophecy, and are of the opinion that Jeremiah and Joel both imitate Obadiah.

On comparing Jeremiah XLIX., 7-22 with Obadiah, it does not appear that the latter made use of the former. Whatever be the relation of the two prophets, Obadiah is the original. The verses common to the two form in Obadiah one compact, consecutive progressive passage. In Jeremiah they are scattered and disjointed. We may conclude, therefore, that Obadiah preceded Jeremiah, and that his prophecy referred to a tragedy already past, which, consequently, could not have been the Chaldæan conquest.

We have already seen that it could not have been the capture of Jerusalem by Shishak in the time of Rehoboam; nor the capture by Jehoash, King of Israel, in the reign of Amaziah, King of Judah: it remains, therefore, that it must have been the capture by the Philistines and Arabians, in the time of Jehoram. This calamity forms a historic epoch both to Joel III., 19, and to Amos I., 6, 11. The relation of Obadiah to these two prophets, so clearly perceived by those who arranged the Canon, inclines us to regard him as belonging to the same prophetic era and circle of thought. Whether he was before Joel, or after Amos, cannot be easily determined.

This conclusion seems to agree best with the inner relationship of this prophecy, which places it entirely within the circle of view of those prophecies, among which the collectors of the Canon have placed it, that is, the oldest. This will appear from an examination of the book.

(1). It does not mention the great monarchs of the world.

(2). The enemies who captured Jerusalem, were strangers and foreigners (v. 11).

(3). Besides the Edomites, the author names none except the Philistines (v. 19), and the Phœnicians (Zarephath, v. 20), both of whom appear in Joel III., 4, as enemies of the Kingdom.

(4). Aram is not mentioned, so that the horizon of Obadiah is narrower than that of Amos (Am. I., 5 ; IX., 7).

(5). The two kingdoms are in existence. The southern one consists of the tribes of Judah (which inhabits the Negeb and the lowland), and Benjamin (v. 19) ; the northern (Ephraim and Gilead) must yet be possessed, that a united kingdom may arise, one army of the children of Israel (vv. 19, 20).

(6). The captives of Jerusalem are not carried away to the east, but are sold as slaves into the west, precisely as in Joel ; to the Javan, (Ionia) of Joel III., 6 corresponds the Sepharad of Obadiah (v. 20).

(7). The middlemen, who made traffic of the captives, are doubtless the same as those named in Am. I., 9 and Joel III., 6, the Phœnicians, whom Obadiah also (v. 20) expressly mentions.

(8). Of a destruction not a word is said, but only of capture and ravage.

(9). The hostile attitude of Edom is by no means a state of things first produced by the Babylonian destruction, and before unheard of. In Joel III., 19, and Amos I., 11 ff. ; IX., 12, precisely as here, Edom appears as an enemy of Judah, deserving double chastisement on account of his original relation to Israel. The Israelites and Edomites were descended from brothers.

It would be incongruous to refer all these predictions just cited, which, for the most part, wear a very distinctly historical aspect, to the incidental position, which Edom occupied two centuries later in the Chaldæan catastrophe ; the more incongruous, because from the time of Moses onward (Num. XX., 14 ff.), the attitude of this neighboring nation toward Israel was, according to the historical books also, hostile in a high degree (1 Sam XIV., 47 ; 2 Sam. VIII., 14 ; 1 Kings XI., 14 ff. ; 2 Kings VIII., 20, etc).

These considerations render it probable that Obadiah prophesied before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians ; and that he should be placed among the earlier prophets. Hofmann, Delitzsch, Keil, and Kleinert are probably not far astray in placing him in the reign of Jehoram, B. C. 889-884.

## THE SCRIPTURAL CONCEPTION OF THE GLORY OF GOD.

BY PROFESSOR H. P. SMITH,

Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

My attention was called to this subject by a recent series of articles and letters in the London *Spectator*. A Roman Catholic writer had emphasized the duty of doing all things to the glory of God, calling attention to the fact that while to be self-centred is in man a vice, it is a necessary attribute of God, who must be moved in all he does by a desire for his own glory. This view was criticized as implying that man could in some way add to or diminish the divine glory. In reply the Romanist distinguished between the intrinsic and the extrinsic glory of God; man cannot, of course, add to what God is in himself, but he can further the *manifestation* of God. This is undoubtedly true. The only question is whether it is proper or scriptural to speak of an intrinsic glory of God—whether it is not always true in Scripture that God's Glory is the external manifestation of something within, which must be called by some other name. The prominence of the idea of God's glory and of man's glorifying Him in the Calvinistic system justifies such study of Bible usage as shall give us clear conceptions of what is meant.

The word glory in our version of the Old Testament is used to render nine different Hebrew words, not all of them, however, referring to God. In the New Testament we have *δόξα* uniformly used except in one instance. *Δόξα* is the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew כְּבוֹד, and as this is the word generally used of the divine glory I will examine it at some length.

The Hebrew word כְּבוֹד is from a root meaning *to be heavy*, first in the physical sense, Qal and adj.; of a yoke, 1 Kgs. XII., 11, of a cloud, Ex. XIX., 16, of Absalom's hair, 2 Sam. XIV., 26; then *to be severe or grievous*, as hard service, Neh. V., 18, a distressing war, 1 Sam. XXXI., 3, of the *oppressive* hand of a ruler or of the hand of Jehovah in affliction, 1 Sam. v., 11 (on the Philistines who had the Ark). Then it means to be heavy in the sense of *sluggish*, as the ears Is. LIX., 1 or the eyes Gen. XLVIII., 10 (Jacob). The adjective is used to describe the heart of Pharaoh where we say his heart was *hard* (Ex. VII., 14). Closely connected with this meaning is the next, *to be numerous or great*, as children Job XIV., 21, cattle, Ex. XII., 28, a people, Num. XI., 14, an army, 1 K. X., 2. We may notice here Ps. XXXVIII., 5, where the Psalmist confesses that his sins are *too heavy* for him. The adjective is used (as we say, a heavy misfortune) to describe a famine, a pesti-

lence or a mourning for the dead. Gen. L., 11 (Hiph. causative of above).

Slightly different is the use in connection with affairs or business, where it denotes *importance*, as we speak of affairs of weight, weighty business—the work that devolved on Moses is called כָּבֵד (burdensome) Ex. XVIII., 18. Only a little remove further is to speak of a man of *weight* who is generally a man of wealth as Abraham is said to be (Gen. XIII., 2) “exceedingly weighty in cattle and in silver and gold.” So Tyre is spoken of as a wealthy city, Ezek. XXVII., 25.

Here we find the point at which the noun כְּבוֹד makes its start. It denotes generally *wealth* or *splendor*. So it is to be translated Is. X., 3:

What will ye do in the day of visitation  
And in the destruction which cometh from afar?  
To whom will ye flee for help  
And where will ye leave your *treasures*?

The allusion is to the ill-gotten gains. So Is. LXI., 6.

The strength of the heathen shall ye eat  
And of their wealth [LXX. ἐν τῷ πλοῦτι] shall ye make boast.

The word is used to describe the pomp of Ahasuerus and of Haman (Esth. I., 4 and V., 11), of Jacob's wealth Gen. XXXI., 3, Joseph's state, Gen. XLV., 23, cf. Ps. XLIX., 17, 18.

“Fear not when a man grows rich,  
When the treasure [כֶּסֶף] of his house is great.  
For in his death he shall not take any of it,  
His treasure [כֶּסֶף] shall not descend with him.”

The word is used of sepulchral pomp, Is. XIV., 18. “All the kings of the nations, all of them, lie in pomp [כֶּסֶף] each in his own house (tomb).” Further of the beauty of Lebanon, Is. X., 18, and of the Temple, Haggai II., 3, of a throne, 1 Sam. I., 8 and of a chariot, Is. XXII., 18 (in the last two cases the noun in the genitive instead of an adjective). The inhabitants of a country are its כֶּסֶף, Is. X., 16.

One of a man's most precious possessions is the esteem of his fellows, which is therefore sometimes called his כֶּסֶף—at least in those passages where it is contrasted with contempt or light esteem (קִלְיוֹן) as Hos. IV., 7. More precious still is one's own soul which is also called כֶּסֶף usually in poetry and parallel with נַפְשׁ as Gen. XLIX., 6, Ps. VII., 6, XVI., 9. The soul is so called probably as being man's highest ornament—that which makes him better than the brutes. Finally God himself is the crowning ornament [כֶּסֶף] of the believer (Ps. III., 4) or of his people (Jer. II., 11).

Coming now to the passages in which כֶּסֶף is ascribed to God, it is evident that we should expect it to refer to some manifestation of Him

rather than to His *being* in itself. This expectation is fulfilled in a number of passages in which this glory is said to be *seen*, some of them in the proper sense. Thus it is said, Ex. XL., 34: "And the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the *glory of Jehovah* filled the Tabernacle;" Num. XIV., 10: "The glory of Jehovah appeared in [or on] the tent of meeting to all the children of Israel;" Deut. V., 21: "And ye said behold Jehovah our God hath showed us [caused us to see] His glory and His greatness, and we have heard his voice from the midst of the fire." The glory of Jehovah in all these cases is the visible appearance of cloud or fire which rested on Sinai or on the Tabernacle. Ezekiel uses the same word; after describing his vision he adds; "This was the appearance of the likeness of the *glory* of Jehovah, and I saw and fell on my face" (ch. I., 28). "And I rose and went out into the plain and behold the *glory* of Jehovah was standing there, like the *glory* which I saw at the river Chebar" (III., 23). Those passages which speak of the glory of God as manifest in creation also imply that it is something visible—as the glory of God on the heavens or recounted by them, Ps. XIX., 2, or filling the earth, Is. VI., 3.

The glory of God then is something made known by outward appearance. It is evident that his character may be made known in other ways than this. It may be seen by the spiritual vision, Is. XL., 5, "The *glory* of Jehovah shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together"—in the redemption of his people, that is. The earth is described as filled with the *knowledge of the glory* of Jehovah (Hab. II., 14). This knowledge may be spread by man, Ps. XCVI., 3. "*Recount* among the heathen his glory (cf. Is. XLII., 8, 12), among all nations his wonderful works." One of the most instructive passages bearing on this subject is Ex. XXXIV., 5, sq. In the preceding chapter Moses has said: I beseech thee show me thy glory; and in answer God has promised to show him such part of it as Moses could bear. The fulfilment of the promise is our passage, "And Jehovah came down in the cloud and stood with him there and called the name of Jehovah. And Jehovah passed before him and cried, Jehovah, Jehovah, a God merciful and compassionate, slow of anger and abounding in love and faithfulness; preserving [his] grace to thousands, taking away iniquity and transgression and sin, but who will not always leave unpunished, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children upon the third generation and upon the fourth." According to this the glory of Jehovah is the *manifestation* of his love and his justice in his dealings with his creatures. Ezekiel also speaks of the divine glory as manifest in the divine judgments (ch. XXXIX., 21). We give glory to him

by confession of sin (Josh. VII., 19) inasmuch as we make his justice manifest.

To *glorify* God can only be one of two things, either to recognize his glory (to acknowledge it) or to make it known to others. The Hebrew uses the same word for honoring man and glorifying God. "A son honors [כָּבֵד] his father and a servant his master; if I be a father where is my honor [כָּבֵד]?" Mal. I., 6. Evidently the honor here claimed is filial respect and obedience—such respect and obedience glorify the recipient. God promises to honor them that honor him (1 Sam. II., 30) where the same verb is used. He glorifies his footstool by showing his glory there (Is. LX., 13). He shows forth his own glory in his destruction of Pharaoh (Ex. XIV., 4) and in his judgments on Sidon (Ezek. XXVIII., 22). One man honors another by courteous or deferential attention—as Samuel did Saul even after he was rejected from the kingship (1 Sam. XV., 30) or as David did to Hanun when he sent him an embassy of condolence. The princes of Ammon at that time said to Hanun: Is David *honoring* thy father in that he sends thee comforters? (2 Sam. X., 3). A false god is in one place spoken of as honored by offerings (Dan. XI., 38). Jehovah also is [glorified] honored by the gifts of his people (Prov. III., 9), by sacrifices (Is. XLIII., 23), by the offering of thanksgiving (Ps. L., 23, תֹּודָה), by having a house built for him (Hag. I., 8); it is possible to glorify him with the lips while the heart is far away (Is. XXIX., 13).

The space proper to a paper of this kind will allow only a brief examination of New Testament usage. The word there used is *δόξα*, and it was adopted by the New Testament writers because it is generally in the LXX. the equivalent of כָּבוֹד. It is derived from a root meaning *to appear* and is in the first instance simply *the appearance* of a thing, hence also in a good sense *reputation, honor*. Passages might be quoted from the New Testament similar in meaning to those already noted. A number refer to the visible splendor which surrounds the throne of God as in the appearance to the shepherds at Bethlehem when the "*glory* of the Lord shone round about them" (Luke II., 9); so of Christ's radiant appearance at the transfiguration (Luke IX., 31). As we might expect, the spiritual side of the divine glory is prominent in the New Testament. John speaks of the disciples as seeing a *glory* as of the only begotten of the Father, in Christ when he became flesh and dwelt among us (I., 14). Christ's *glory* was seen in the miracle at Cana (II., 11) and in the raising of Lazarus (XI., 4). He himself declares that his father is glorified in the fruitfulness of his disciples (John XV., 8), and Paul describes us as reflecting the glory of God (1 Cor. III., 18). All these passages show that the glory of God is a



moral glory, a manifestation of the moral attributes in the divine character.

One word in conclusion. The writer spoken of above urges that to be self-centred is in God an excellence, and the ordinary view of such passages as the one which speaks of God as creating all things for his own glory, makes them assert this same truth. It is possible to overlook the other truth, however, that God regards his own glory as most enhanced in his beneficence towards his creatures. He desires that his character should be known to them because it is to them the greatest of all blessings, to know and love and honor him—and because they will find it a privilege to make him known to their fellows.

---

## THE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE LIFE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY REV. H. O. ROWLANDS,

Elgin, Ill.

It is proposed to consider the doctrine of the immortality of the soul in the Old Testament, as it is defined in the New. It is not *indestructibility of substance*; the grossest materialist holds to that. Nor endless existence; the pantheist holds that man does not cease to exist at his death any more than does the wave perish when it subsides on the water; but that soul and wave return into their original states. It is into a like conclusion the Light (?) of Asia leads man. Nirvana is a *kind* of immortality, an eternity of essence; but compared with Christ's teaching of the doctrine, Gautama's definition is little better than annihilation; conscious personality, individuality, and identity are ended forever when the soul reaches perfection.

The Christian definition of immortality is that *death is the ascent of the person into a higher condition of life.*

This definition implies,—(a) that in the change of death nothing is lost to personality; the change is that of conditions and environments. The "shuffling off of the mortal coil" does not affect the identity of the person any more than does a change of garment. (b) That in the new state, as in the former, spirit cannot be conceived of as personal unless conditioned by some environment; this we name *body*. The New Testament speaks of the future environment as the person "putting on incorruption and immortality,"—as "being clothed upon,"—and as a "spiritual body." All this shows that the spirit-life of man will be there as here conditioned; it will be personal and tangible,—"known" as it now "knoweth." (c) That the future state of the soul is higher than the present one. Life in it is intenser. Whether the

person moves in the enjoyment of his rewards, or in a penal, or purgatorial state, the soul has a larger scope for its faculties, and greater advantages with which to attain to its capabilities. It will be unclogged by clay, unhampered by the limitations of mortality; the bars of flesh and blood will no longer imprison it,—but it will enjoy, or suffer forever its natural liberty in its native clime.

Does the Old Testament teach this conscious, personal immortality? Did the heroes and saints of its history apprehend the truth in this light? The popular belief of Bible readers is that the future life is directly and plainly taught in the Old Testament, and that the proofs of it are as convenient and abundant as in the New. In this, popular belief is certainly in error; for, while *all* regard the New Testament the authoritative text-book of the subject, there is a great learning that fails to see anything bearing upon the faith in the Old, or at most, but dim hopes and aspirations with respect to it. Therefore, in examining the subject, and seeking reasonable and right conclusions, evidences that are disputed by great learning must not be admitted without at least questioning them.

The Old Testament writings reflect the intellectual life and religious beliefs of the Hebrews, and where their interpretation is doubtful, it would be a great help in understanding them if from other sources we discover what was the *probable* attitude of the Hebrew mind with respect to such questions. This knowledge we must seek in the records of the times and nations that environed the beginnings of the Hebrew nation in both its patriarchal and national life. The ancestors of the Hebrews, from among whom Abraham was called,—the Chaldæans—were believers in a future existence for the soul. The mythology of the Babylonians as made known in their great epic, and particularly in the sixth lay, gives a good idea of the Chaldæan conception of the future life. Certain favored persons were encouraged to look forward to a life immortal and blessed in a land where the gods feast and know no evil. The Chaldaic Hades is much like the Hebrew Sheol and the Homeric Hades. From among such people the "Father of the faithful" came, and he could not have migrated from them without carrying with him, not only their sublime monotheistic faith, but the doctrine that is second only in importance to that, viz.:—the belief in a future state.

At the inception of the *national life* of the Hebrews we find them in Egypt, the slaves of a great, intellectual, and religious people. They must have been permeated by the thoughts, faith and religion of their masters. This we see in the record that when they had escaped the thralldom of the brick-yard in which for 400 years they had suffer-

ed, still they were not able to shake off from their minds the religious customs and beliefs of the Egyptians; they worshipped a calf after the manner of their late masters; they indulged in divinations, necromancies, and witchcraft,—superstitions so prevalent in Egypt. A prohibition of these customs under the penalty of death was not enough to eradicate them from the life of the Hebrew. But, no faith so permeated and molded the life and character of the Egyptians as their belief in the immortality of the soul. They embalmed their dead, and while the exact purpose of this custom is not assured, the trend of testimony is that it rose from the faith that the spirit would again occupy the preserved body. Indeed, any system or scheme for the *preservation* of the body, rather than its destruction, has arisen from the hope of its resurrection. Cremation is a custom materialistic in its origin and prevalence. It must not be concluded, however, that the Egyptian idea of immortality was identical with the Christian; for although the doctrine of rewards and punishments in the future life was rigidly held, still, while all the dead went down to *Kerneret* (the Egyptian Sheol), the resurrection was the portion only of those who had committed no mortal sin. The reprobate and lost, after a long course of torments and agonies is condemned to annihilation; he is beheaded on the infernal scaffold, and is at last devoured. The good, after cycles of time spent in purifications, combats, victories, at last comes out triumphant and his whole being is absorbed into the god Osiris. The First Giver of life becomes at last its eternal home.

Such were the faiths of the two great nations that environed the fontal existence of the Hebrews; the Chaldæans being at the head of their family descent, and the Egyptians at the beginning of their national life; and we cannot escape the conclusion that these nations impressed their belief in immortality upon the first pupils of the Old Testament writings, and on the writers themselves. From those facts it is assured that the doctrine of existence beyond death was known to the Hebrews. But, could they from these sources have cherished such a faith in the truth as Christianity unfolds? The Greek mind was certainly no less acute than was the Hebrew, and if the Greeks did not receive their faith directly from Egypt, their scholars, poets, and philosophers were greatly influenced by Egyptian thought and learning. Indeed, it may not be proper to aver that any one nation received the *conception*, the *idea* of immortality from another nation; the faith, like the one in the existence of God, or in the ideas of good and evil, is innate, intuitive to the soul; but we readily trace the coloring, modifications, phases, *species*, as it were, of the doctrine transmitted from one country, or nation to another. And if it be objected that

Greece received this faith from Egypt, it is certain that either both nations received it from common Oriental sources, or that Egypt was the religious teacher of the Greek. The ideas of future rewards and punishments, of gradations in the unseen world, and the doctrine of transmigration cherished in Egypt and Greece, all point to a close kinship of thought on eschatology. In my judgment this similarity is due to the fact that Greece was the pupil of Egypt, as the Hebrews had been, although not to the same extent.

Consider this faith as it appears in the mold of the Greek mind, and see if it bear any kinship to the Christian conception of it. Surveying the field from Homer to Plato, covering over six centuries, we discover the following conception of the future life: The very bad after death were banished into Tartarus; the very good entered Elysium; but both these regions were of a dreamy and unsubstantial character. As to Elysium, Homer in his Dantean visions represents Achilles wandering among the shades and declaring the meanest life on earth to be preferable to the unsubstantial glory of Elysium. In the mind of this poet death was the destruction of personality; for in the first lines of the Iliad, he sings of the heroes slain in battle before Troy, that their souls were dispatched to Hades [Plato would have said that the *pure essence* had gone to exist independent of the material], and *they themselves* were left a prey to dogs and birds. Indeed, in the Greek mind immortality—such as it was—was not for a man, but for the gods, and the few they made divine; and the names Tartarus, Hades and Elysium were attached to the locations of disembodied life-forces. Gods alone were immortal. Whatever may have been Socrates' ideas of immortality [the *Phædo*, the most direct in its bearing upon the subject, is confessedly more Platonic than Socratic], it is certain that Plato's ideas were far from being identical with those of the New Testament. He floundered amid speculations of pre-existence, transmigration, and the incorporeality of the soul. In the last he seems to occupy a middle position between Brahminical absorption and the Christian "incorruption" and "immortality," with which the soul will be "clothed upon" at the resurrection. The conception that death is an enlargement of the personality, an intensification of life, is certainly not found in Greek eschatology. The oration on Mars Hill on the resurrection of the dead would have fallen on unbelieving ears in the palmy days of Athens, as it did when it was delivered by the Apostle of the Great Revelation. And when the Greek theology and religion came in contact with the more precise and exacting analysis of the Romans, both vanished into fancies and fictions in the agnosticism of the Stoic, and materialism of the Epicurean.

Remembering that Abraham received his teachings on the Future Life from the Chaldæans, and Moses from the Egyptians, almost identical sources, and observing what those doctrines were, as they seed out in the religion of the Greeks and Romans, we have a basis to *theorize*, at least, as to what were the Hebrew conceptions of the Great Truth, so far as they received it from their teachers in religion and masters in politics and thought. From these data we conclude that the conception was crude, imperfect and uninspirational. Another source of education on this doctrine open to the Hebrews, was the early records of creation—records that did not concern their national life, but were known to them. They read, as we do, that man was formed out of the dust—but that was only a *form*, a lifeless statue ; afterwards God breathed into him the “breath of life,” and the “living soul” was the result.

The thoughtful Hebrew must have noticed that all creations were caused to evolve out of the earth, and had an earthly life,—i. e., they bore the nature of the source ; so also when he read that the living soul was an impartation of God—His breathing—His *living*—this creation also must bear the character of its source ; hence a personality, and personality is an underlying fact of immortality. It is from this record of man's origin—a record that has ever in some shape or another, been the common heritage of the race of man—that all nations of the East, particularly the Chaldæans and Egyptians, primarily reasoned the truth of immortality. They saw the Divine Decree verified that every herb yielded fruit “after its kind whose seed was in itself”—the growth partaking of the nature of the seed. It was an easy step from that to the conclusion that what was born of spirit is a spirit, and that an immortal person would endow His offspring with personal immortality, since they were born in his likeness and image.

This root-record of the divine birth of man must ever have thrilled its possessor with the dream, the hope of immortality of some kind, together with a faith in it, but, as we have already seen, a *crude* faith.

Having considered some of the great sources from which the intellectual and religious life of the Hebrews unfolded, we are better able to understand their peculiar scriptures without calling to our aid the assumption that God had revealed to them this truth, for this assumption is begging the very question at issue. It should be remembered that the poverty of direct, emphatic declarations on the subject is not a presumption against the view that the Old Testament teaches the doctrine ; for the Old Testament is a political history rather than a treatise on religion. The Hebrew authors were in the main statesmen and politicians and not deep thinkers, like Plato, Gautama, Zoroas-

ter, or the Egyptian sages. They wrote for the benefit, and in the interest of the state. The hymns of Miriam, Moses, Deborah, Asaph, and David were national songs of thanksgiving, sorrow or supplication, and not theological hymns, such as we write and sing. They were certainly religious; so was the state religious. The Old Testament was to the Hebrews what Bancroft's History is to Americans; theology was but an *incident* to it. The account of creation is given only that the origin of the Hebrew race may be seen. If there had been a great Hebrew thinker, a religious philosopher (the one that came nearest to such a character was for a large part of his life an agnostic on this subject), we should now possess a treatise containing the views, hopes and beliefs of Palestine on this great question. Hence, the meagreness of Old Testament teaching in respect to this doctrine must not be construed as a sure proof that the writers were ignorant concerning it. In a few passages in the Old Testament the doctrine by all fair interpretation is declared; as in Psalm XVI., 10; Ps. XVII., 15. Isa. XXVI., 19, Dan. XII., 2. In many more it is fairly implied. Without doubt many passages are quoted as teaching the faith which have no bearing upon it. To claim that a future existence was an unknown faith to the Hebrews seems to me an emasculation of the first and plainest sense of those passages; without that supposition a far-fetched and unwarranted interpretation must be given to them. No portions of the Old Testament indicate the popular belief of the Hebrews on the subject more than do some of its narratives. It is immaterial what construction, or interpretation we give to these; for it is not for the truth of the narratives we are now seeking, but for the popular faith they reflect. The translation of Enoch and Elijah; the story of the recall of Samuel by the Witch of Endor; the resuscitation of the widow's child where it is recorded that his "*soul came back to him*,"—these records, with others similar to them, go to show that the belief prevailed that death was not the end of existence. As to what *kind* of an existence, its condition and duration, nothing is explained, but an after-death existence is certainly acknowledged. In the light of the foregoing statements may we conclude that the Future Life is taught in the Old Testament with the fulness it is in the New? Did the poets and prophets of the Old Dispensation understand its import, as did the authors of the Gospels and Letters? *No*. There are other facts that qualify such claims; facts that go to show that the Old Testament conception of this faith was less clear, and had in it far less power and influence than the conception revealed in the New.

1. In the dispensation of the Gospel so bright has been the light, so

potent the sentiment, so clear the conditions of the future life that humanity has been guided, shaped and swayed by it. Souls receive inspiration from it, as flowers receive their odor and color from sky and sun. Its resplendent beams strike through the darkness of solitude, lighting it with the presence of Heaven and of the "cloud of witnesses" that press around the Gates of Pearl. The weary and heartsick are cheered by it as the midnight traveler is inspired by the gleams of light from his home-window. By faith in it men and women in sickness and in death have beheld the City of Light born out of the mists in the glory of its becking joys. The old Hebrews needed the same consolations; but nowhere do we find a weeping Rachel or bereaved Rispah receiving help from this faith. The truth is cherished and mentioned by only a few, and that in poetic flights. Admitting that the passages usually quoted as referring to it are correctly interpreted, even then only the tips of the high mountain peaks are colored by this holy light. In no place is the truth of immortal existence named as a warning to eschew sin, or an inspiration to live holy. Rewards and retributions, hopes and fears are limited by the horizon of this life. A brief life, material judgments, temporal retribution were the threats for a life of sin. Canaan, a long life, and material prosperity were the rewards of virtue.

2. Consider the one prominent term used in speaking of the future state—*Sheol*. The word refers to the place in which the departed dead exist. It is found sixty-five times in the Old Testament. But the word betokened no comfort. Its very origin had a gloomy association (probably) from a verb meaning to *ask*, to *inquire*, implying that the netherworld always *demand*ed, with no hint of its ever returning a life that had been taken. The *location* of Sheol was in the depths, a land of darkness, Job x., 22. It was to the best of men never a place of desire, except when they were overwhelmed with afflictions, Job III., 13-22. The Psalms are full of aversion to it, as LXXXVIII., 10-13 and many other instances. Hezekiah, in his matchless poem of gratitude, rejoices that he has escaped it for a season, Isa., XXXVIII., 9-20. There was no difference in the lot of those who existed there, Job III., 17-19. The realm is marked as one in which consciousness and personality are limited, a land of shadow, of silence, of dreamless sleep. Passions were paralyzed, and the spiritual energies benumbed. And here men were gathered to sleep.

3. A further evidence that the Old Testament's revelation of immortality was faint is the fact that while the most spiritual alone were able to profit by it, yet *they* were not satisfied except in a few of their inspirational hours. Often in times of depres-

sion they were given over to uncertainty, and even to a positive hopelessness of a life after death. Job moans: "But man dieth and wasteth away, yea, man giveth up the ghost—[Heb. breathes out, expires] and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not, till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep" (XIV., 10-13). He calls the change into which death leads him "the land of darkness, of the shadow of death, without any order, where the light is as darkness (x., 22). My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle, and are spent without hope. My life is wind; mine eye shall see no more good (marginal reading—"shall not return to enjoy"). David prays: "O spare me that I may recover strength before I go hence, and be no more." Again: "What profit is there in my blood when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise thee?" (xxx., 9). Isaiah says: "The grave cannot praise thee; death can not celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth" (XXXVIII., 18).

These passages—and there are many others similar to them—go to show how weak was the faith of the Old Testament saints in immortality, and hence how limited was the revelation of it. Indeed, it can hardly be called a settled faith; rather a hope kindled in moments of great inspiration. It was a poetry, and true poetry is intuitive with respect to the highest truths, and prophetic of their revelation. The true relation of the Old Testament to the Future Life is that of *gradual development*. In the earliest writing of that volume it is exceedingly dim—so much so that the learned Sadducee—who rejected the later scriptures—could not find it there; and when Christ quoted from them to prove it, it was such an evidence that the saints of the patriarchal times could not possibly have enjoyed. In the story of the creation of man it must be reasoned from inferences, and not accepted as a declaration. We come to the translation of Enoch, and while that event *hints* at the fact, it is not conclusive. He walked with God, "and God took him," but suppose he had been a less worthy man, would he then have been taken? Moreover, his immortality is but a continued life—he did not die—he passed the king of shadows without a battle; suppose that death had come to him, would he have survived? Jacob saw a ladder reaching into heaven; it was the highway of celestial immortals, but there is no hint that he saw a disembodied spirit of man moving on the strange path. There were other truths that must be taught the race before this great spiritual one could be appreciated or apprehended. Standing as we do, in the spiritual glow of the Christian faith,



we are not able to realize the preparation of heart and mind required to conceive of and accept the doctrine of Life Everlasting. Our missionaries, who come in contact with those whose education is in the line of soul annihilation, or absorption, have realized the difficulty of getting men even to *appreciate* the gift of an eternal personal existence.

In the age following the deluge the sacredness of human life was impressed upon the race. The *present life* must be made "worth living" before the value of life in the future could be understood. In the patriarchal age the great idea of GOD was unfolded; His personality and communion with men. Hence Abraham was called "The Friend" [of God] and the "Father of the Faithful." When the patriarchal system passed into the national life of the Jewish people, there were impressed upon men the authority of God, and His government over men; His right to their service and love; the holiness of His laws, the wickedness of sin, with a constant pointing to the doctrine of forgiveness. "The future life was not denied," as Mr. Stanley says in his History of the Jewish Church; "but it was overlooked, set aside, overshadowed by the consciousness of the living, actual presence of God himself." Axioms, definitions, must be learned before entering on the problems whose solution is eternity. The divine plan of education was what Paul has so philosophically expressed: "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual." The personality of God, His companionship and government, were the stalk on which this truth must unfold; the worth of life, of the home, of the family, of a land long promised, were the outward husks, the chaff that were to ensheath and protect this richer spiritual faith. The earthly, temporal blessings, coming in the name of God and religion, were the heralds of the old Dispensation crying out to the soul of man that something grander, worthier, and more enduring was coming. But a full revelation of it could not then have been appreciated. Passing onward to the age of Hebrew poetry we find expressions and experiences that are quivering with the stirring of the great Truth. Strokes of great calamity struck from the poet-king sparks of the divine hope, and in its gleams we read such words: "I shall be satisfied when I awake in Thy likeness." And: "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me into glory." "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for he shall receive me." As the nation was, by ages of disappointments and sorrows, trained to consider God's providence from a more spiritual standpoint, still more of the great Truth was unfolded, and the seraph-prophet

declares that there was a kingdom in which "the dead men" should again live and righteousness receive a fitting reward. At last, after the Hebrews had received the training of Mosaism; after psalmists and prophets had for centuries taught and inspired them; after they had lost their Canaan, and were captives and slaves in a foreign land, they became spiritualized. They had read change and mortality in all earthly things; and longings were generated in them for the incorruptible and eternal. Then arose one of the divinest of the Hebrew poets, and speaking when the sacred language was passing away, and his own years on earth were closing, and his faith clearly discerning the borderland of joys that were fadeless, he says: "They that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt; and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever." Dan XII., 2, 3.

During the inter-Testament ages,—ages of terrible storms that beat upon the Chosen People, the great hope was so intensified as to become a living *faith*. Doubtless then it was that the philosophy, or rather the *gospel* of the *Phaedo* had reached the Jewish mind by the way of Alexandria. In the Book of Daniel we see what appear to be traces of contact between the *Zendavesta* and the Jew,—but no matter as to the means by which came greater light, we are able to read from the Book of Wisdom such glowing passages as: "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God: in the sight of the unwise they seem to die, but they are in peace." "God created man to be immortal, and made him an image of his own eternity, &c." So Miltonic in its views of the past, so Dantean in its vision of the future is the Book of Enoch, that the writers of the New Testament have borrowed figures, and similitudes from it,—and it throbs with the hope of immortality as the heavens throb forth the starbeams. We see realized in the life of a nation what is true in the life of man: while earth was enjoyable to the Hebrews, and the Syrian Canaan fast in their possession, they thought little of a brighter home. But when providence withdrew her favors, and great calamities overwhelmed them, they longingly turned their eyes toward a hope and faith that held before them a realm rich in joys everlasting; and immortality shed its fadeless bloom on all the fields. In sailing between two shores—in the measure that one shore is removed and its landscapes become mere outlines, and even these last become dim,—in that measure does the shore beyond reveal its outlines and life. And so, as men and nations are removed from earthliness and mortality they are brought into communion with

the spiritual, the unseen, and the immortal. As earth recedes, heaven approaches. Notwithstanding the fact that a belief in a future existence was cherished by all nations, as well as by the Hebrews, all evidences go to show that the faith was often weak and always little better than a caricature of the sublime Christian doctrine. Those who confidently claim that the Jews held it are not so clear that they considered the resurrection to be the portion of the wicked and the gentile. Heaven seemed to be like the first Canaan,—something in keeping for the pious child of Abraham. Transmigration, absorption, annihilation were the phases of the future world to the heathen. The Pharisaic conception of it was sensuous and selfish. The resurrection was something that would glorify the Jews and enlarge the kingdom of the coming earthly Messiah. At the beginning of the Christian era the civilized world had become faithless with respect to the doctrine. The sensuality and worldliness of Rome—which she radiated on all her provinces—were like mists from icebergs completely shadowing the faith. The pantheistic Stoic and godless Epicurean united at least in one thing, viz., that the resurrection of the dead was visionary, unworthy of the philosophy of the Stoic and repugnant to the sensual Epicurean. The Judæan phase of the resurrection was at this time a hideous spiritualism, and while the Saviour condemns the unbelief of the Sadducee, he never commends the belief of Pharisee or Herodian. And though the Jews had the Old Testament writings as we have, the doctrine of the Future Life they deduced from it as it prevailed at the appearance of Christ was sensuous, crude and monstrous. They, like Plato, needed something stronger than a “raft” on which they might sail to the land afar off; a “firmer vessel” of a “divine word” must find the sea-tossed voyagers.

#### CONCLUSION.

The relations of the Old Testament to this faith are like unto its relations to other revealed truths,—from its beginning to the close there is a constant unfolding. The light increases as the spiritual eye of man is able to receive it. Indeed, here, as elsewhere, the law of revelation of all truth, political, social, moral, scientific and spiritual, is the same; by inquiries, hints, inspirational prophecies, there is a gradual unfolding until at last comes the perfect day. For thousands of years the Gospel doctrine of the Future Life struggled for a place in the heart and faith of the world; it was tortured, caricatured or banished; at last there came from the dominion of death the RISEN CHRIST, clothed in the habiliments of a spiritual body, possessing the

flexibilities and attributes of a spiritual life, and in this glorious, mysterious environment He ascended into heaven ; there for the first time was death abolished and life and immortality brought into a full and resplendent light.

---

## STUDIES IN ARCHÆOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

J. A. SMITH, D. D.,

Editor of *The Standard*, Chicago.

### II.

#### Tradition, in its Relation to History; (1) To History in General.

##### I.

This subject seems germane to the principal topic of these studies, because of the fact that alike in archæological inquiry and in dealing with comparative religion, we look so often for the archæological record or for the material of comparison, *both* to history and to tradition. This is more especially the case when what is being compared is that inspired record which we have in the Bible with those belonging to pre-historic and other ancient literatures. We claim that in the Bible we have history, even a reliable history of the world's first origin. Those other memorials of the same early time are confessedly in form, and to a great degree in substance, legendary, and no one thinks of accepting them as history, in any proper sense of that word. The nature of the distinction here implied, its bearing and value in connection with questions in archæology and in religion, are points which seem deserving of some study.

##### THE QUESTION STATED.

The nature of the question, and its bearing upon matters belonging to the present inquiry, may be illustrated by taking a passage from the introduction to Prof. Lenormant's "Beginnings of History." The work itself is one of great value, and its author, who was, as readers know, Professor of Archæology at the National Library in Paris, shows himself in this very introduction to be as sincerely Christian in his convictions as he is by consent of scholars everywhere learned and competent. Now, speaking of the first chapters in the Book of Genesis, Prof. Lenormant says :

"That which we read in the first chapters of Genesis is not an account dictated by God himself, the possession of which was the exclusive privilege of the chosen people. It is a tradition, whose origin is lost in the night of the remotest ages, and which all great nations of Western Asia possessed in common, with some variations. The very form given it in the Bible is so closely related to that which has been lately discovered in Babylon and Chaldæa, it follows so exactly the same course, that it is quite impossible for one to doubt any longer that it has the same origin. The family of Abraham carried this tradition with it in the migration which brought it from Ur of the Chaldees into Palestine, and even then it was undoubtedly fixed, either in written or in oral form ; for beneath the expressions of the Hebrew text in more than one place there appear certain things, which can be explained only as expressions peculiar to the Assyrian language. \* \* \* The first chapters of Genesis," he adds, "constitute a 'Book of the Beginnings,' in accordance with the stories handed down in Israel from generation to generation, ever since the times of the Patriarchs, which in all its essential affirmations is parallel with the statements of the sacred books from the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris."

Now, it is a fair question whether the word "tradition," most properly applied to Chaldean and Assyrian legends, ought not to be at least very much qualified when applied to the narrative in Genesis, either in itself or in its sources. Prof. Lenormant's language might seem to imply that the narrative in Genesis is a tradition, in the same sense and to the same extent as the Chaldean legend. Of this he appears to be aware, and so he adds what it is a real pleasure to quote :

"If this is so," are his words, "I shall, perhaps, be asked: Where, then, do you find the divine inspiration of the writers who made this archaeology—that supernatural help by which, as a Christian, you must believe them to be guided? Where? In the absolutely new spirit which animates their narrative even though the form of it may have remained in almost every respect the same as among the neighboring nations."

He does full justice, in this connection, to the monotheism, the elevated moral tone, and the value in general of the Genesis record, and he declares, with emphasis, that "between the Bible and the books of Chaldea there is all the distance of one of the most tremendous revolutions which have ever been effected in human beliefs." There will be occasion in a subsequent article to consider the question whether what he speaks of as a "revolution" can properly be so characterized. For the present, the question seems to be whether, after all, he might not have condensed what was last quoted in a single sentence, by saying that the difference between the Bible and the Chaldean books is simply this—that while the Chaldean books are *tradition*, worked up into legend, the Bible is *history*. But this suggests a further question—What are some of the distinctions between tradition and history, in themselves and in their sources, and how do we find them related to one another in the primitive annals of our race, and in subsequent periods? A few suggestions touching this general inquiry may have a measure of interest and profit in the present study, and be a help in estimating the value of such teaching as this of Prof. Lenormant, when it comes in our way.

#### 1. AN HISTORICAL ELEMENT IN TRADITION.

Now, first of all, there is a sense in which we may say that tradition *is* history. Of course, not in any adequate sense, but in a way that must be recognized and taken along with us in any such study as the present one. Tradition, of the kind now in question, like history, owes its origin to what we may term *the historical impulse* in man, and in the intellectual life of the world. We should much mistake, if we were to look upon historical production, of whatever age, as a mere literary incident,—that in the beginning of such production some person chanced upon this sort of narrative, and finding that it gave him readers continued in it, while others, impelled by his success, copied his example. No one of the permanent forms of intellectual production originates in this way. Scientific production is due to the fact that it is natural for men to observe nature, to be moved by the amazing phenomena of the physical world, to note *physical facts*; and that it is no less natural for them to put these facts in a certain relation with each other—the relation of cause and effect, of use and adaptation, of resemblance and difference—and classify them accordingly. Philosophy is due to a tendency in man, inborn and imperative—especially in some men—to look below the facts for underlying principles, and above them, in search of that which is higher than they, and which may supply a higher *reason* for them than simply the circumstance of their existence. Poetry is the song-spirit, as-

suming for itself form and utterance ; while the whole literature of the imagination, the fancy, and the taste, grows out of inherent tendencies of the intellect as really as trees spring out of the soil. To observe, to inquire, to reason, to sing, to invent, and weave, and expatiate—these belong to the very nature of man ; they are manifestations of the intellectual life. The same in its essential character is that which we may term the historical impulse. It is the operation of an instinct in man, prompting him to value and to cherish that which belongs to his past, whether as an individual, a nation, or a race. It is the prompting of that interest which all men feel in knowing, not only, what is, but in preserving as a treasure of knowledge scarcely less valued, that which has been ; an interest in events of the past, the same in kind, essentially, as that which they feel in things of the present. Such a being as man, living in such a world, having such experiences, could not be conceived of *without* a history, in some more or less perfect sense.

Now, it is obvious that what form the operation of this historical impulse will take must depend very much upon the conditions under which it acts. The history of a primitive people will be only such as a primitive people are capable of ; but to them it will be history. Whether they themselves believe the whole of it, or not, whether or not they are conscious of the poetical and mythical accessories which may in time so enwrap the original germ of fact as to make its discovery by after ages a matter of such difficulty,—this which they produce is, for them, history. It is for those who produce it the historical impulse strong within them ; that same which, in a later, more mature and more cultivated age will insist upon historical *fact* as the essential part of history, and upon the *dress* in which it is clothed as properly intended only to set forth the fact more vividly and to heighten its effect.

Thus it comes about that among all primitive peoples of whom we have any clear information, we find what, in distinction from history proper, we call tradition. I imagine that we rather undervalue these traditions, as to what they were to those for whom they were thus in the place of history. Perhaps we do not realize what a large element they must have supplied in the intellectual life of the age when they so much abounded. There have been, however, even in modern times—some are found nearly or quite at the present time—examples which may help us conceive this part of our subject in some measure correctly. It is quite within the memory of living men—I am not sure but it is the case at present—that in the Highlands of Scotland persons could be found who held in memory, and who could recite, at great length, that which to the primitive Celt, or Gael, was the history of the heroic age of his own fervid race. Principal Shairp in one of his lectures at the University of Oxford, gives some interesting facts upon this subject. He quotes a writer, a Mr. Skene, who had devoted many years to personal visitations in the remoter parts of the Highlands, where the manners and habits of the primitive race most survived, as telling how “the mountains and lakes are everywhere redolent of names connected with the heroes and actions” of that Fenian race in whom Celt and Gael alike recognize their ancestry ; and as showing how “a body of popular legends, whether in poetry or prose, arising out of these, and preserved by oral recitation, must have existed [and it would seem still exists] in the country where this topography sprang up.” Mr. Skene cites also another witness as telling how it was, until quite recently, “the constant amusement or occupation

of the Highlanders in the winter time to go by turns to each other's houses in every village either to recite, or hear recited, the poems of Ossian, and other songs and poems." Principal Shairp then adds on his own part: "Almost all the native Gaels could recite some parts of these, but there were professed seannachies, or persons of unusual power of memory, who could go on repeating Fenian poems for two or three whole nights continuously. I have myself," he adds, "known men who have often heard five hundred lines of continuous Fenian poetry recited at one time."

We can readily see how one of us, seated by the turf fire, some winter night, in a Highland shealing, and hearing some white-haired patriarch reciting to a circle of eager and excited listeners some legend of Fingal, or Cuthullin, or Oscar, the war of Inis-Thona or the siege of Carric-Thura—how in such circumstances we could well imagine what the traditions of a primitive race might be to them;—in the measure of fact which might be included, large or small, a history, and in the fervid poetical strain, the enthusiasm of patriotic eulogy, and the stirring words which told of the battles and deaths of heroes, an inspiration handed on from father to son; breathing and living in the whole life of the people;—how such traditions, with others different in origin but like in spirit might become to them a history, in ultimate mythical forms a religion, and, in the sense possible to primitive peoples, a philosophy.

It would seem, again, that it must be the germ of history which such legends enclose that gives them their chief vitality, and prolongs their life from century to century. Do we not, ourselves, find a large part of our interest in the legends of King Arthur, for example, whether in the quaint narrative of old Geoffrey, or in the fascinating rhymes of Tennyson, in the more or less sure conviction we may have that back of all the fiction there is a history? "The story of Arthur and his knights," says Principal Shairp, "sprang from the Cymri, and had its root, probably, in some vicissitudes of their early history, when the Saxons invaded their country and drove them to the western shores of Britain. Latin chroniclers and French minstrels, at a later day, took up the story of their doings, and handed it on, transformed in character and invested with all the hues of mediæval chivalry. It is, in fact, an old Cymric legend, seen by us through the haze which centuries of chivalric sentiment have interposed. But, however transfigured, vestiges of the Arthurian story linger to this day in all lands where descendants of the Cymri dwell—in Brittany, in Cornwall, in Wales, in the old Cymric kingdom of Strath-Clyde. Merlin lies buried at Drummelzier-on-Tweed; Gueneverre at Meigle, close to the foot of the so-called Grampians; Arthur's most northern battle was fought, according to Mr. Skene, near the foot of Loch Lomond." We may also recall the passage in Hume where he speaks of Arthur as a Prince of the Silures in Northern Britain, called to their help by his countrymen in the southern part of the island, in a moment of dire extremity in their struggle against the invading Saxons. "This," says Hume, "is that Arthur so much celebrated in the songs of Thaliessin and the other British bards, and whose military achievements have been blended with so many fables as even to give occasion for entertaining a doubt of his real existence. But poets," he adds, with much reason, "though they disfigure the most certain history with their fictions, and use strange liberties with truth where they are the sole historians, as among the Britons, have commonly some foundation for their wildest exaggerations." Whoever may have visited the city and castle of Warwick, in England, previous to the burning of the castle,

might have found, and may possibly still, traces of another hero, whose exploits, real or fictitious, belong to the period when Saxon and Dane fought for the possession of the island to which neither of them had any other right than that of conquest—giant Guy of Warwick, the reputed founder of the earldom. His tremendous helmet and spear, and his mighty punch-bowl—at least these are assigned to him in the legend—are shown in the porter's lodge at the castle gate; while at Guy's Cliff, a beautiful and romantic spot two miles from the city, is seen the cave in which, as a voluntary hermit, he is said to have passed the closing years of his life.

It is a long step backward, no doubt, from instances such as these to those traditions which at the dawn of history preserved all that, apart from inspiration, could be known of the primitive life of the world. But primitive man is much the same sort of being in every age and in both hemispheres. The matter of those traditions which are now found inscribed in libraries of baked-brick amidst the ruins of Chaldean and Assyrian cities, was very different from that of those to which reference has just been made. They belong, not to the later, but to the very earliest period of man's career on the earth; and they relate themselves, not alone to the secular history of races and nations, but also and especially to that inspired history in which is told us all we can now know of the very beginnings of the world and of man. And still these which have been cited may illustrate to us general features of tradition in its relation to history, which will become of use to us further along in this inquiry.

## 2. IT IS STILL NOT HISTORY.

But it should be especially observed, in the second place, that after all, in that which most essentially characterizes the historical, tradition is *not* history. This may seem almost like a truism; but there are points involved in it which are essential to the main purpose here, and so we may put what is very much like an axiom in the form of a proposition.

We are speaking still, let it be observed, of tradition as found among primitive peoples and races. There may be a certain kind of local tradition, in an historical age, which is as truly historical as most of what we find in the written history. In an historical age, however, there exists, even amongst the people, what Mr. Grote, the historian of Greece, terms "the historical sense." There may be in local traditions of the kind just noticed occasional accretions not strictly according to fact, and variations in the form of the narrative such as that the son will not tell the story exactly as the father told it to him. But the story never becomes mythical. We do not find the supernatural introduced in order to enhance the element of the marvelous, nor is the invention of the narrator allowed to run riot in transforming the story into whatever guise of wonder and prodigy his imagination will suggest. Should this be attempted by him he would be reproved, at once, by lack of faith in his hearers, or by the testimony of those who knew the story in its correct form. And he, himself, would so feel the absurdity of such an attempt, were it to occur to him, as perhaps to keep him from taxing the credulity of his hearers in this way, at all. The most unlettered mind, in an age like our own, has this sense of what is, and what is not, probable as history, and arraigns the improbable at once at the bar of judgment.

These conditions, however, do not exist amongst a primitive people. Least of all can they have existed in an age when the world was new; when, as yet, history



cannot have been written at all, and when the historical impulse had no guidance from the historical sense. In fact, even in comparatively late periods, we can trace the operation of unregulated impulses of this nature, in ways which illustrate what must have been the case in the primitive times of the race. We find some rather suggestive examples, for instance, in mediæval literature. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were produced, in France, what are called the "Chansons de Geste"—songs of the achievements of heroes. In many of these songs Charlemagne holds much the same place as Arthur in the literature founded upon the old British legend. The writers of them are well nigh as reckless in their dealings with history as the creator of some old Grecian or Roman myth might be. They make Charlemagne the leader of a crusade to the Holy Land two or three centuries before any such crusade had even been undertaken. They make him, though he never set foot outside of Europe, a conqueror of Jerusalem from the Saracen, and tell how he obtained possession of precious relics, like the crown of thorns and other such; how he carried these relics to Rome, whence they were taken to Spain by a Saracen emir in command of an army; while to recover these relics was the object of that expedition into Spain by Charlemagne against the Saracens, in the return of which the heroic Roland fell amidst the heights of Roncevalles. That Charlemagne never saw Jerusalem; that he was no such superstitious devotee as this story represents; that such an one as he would no more lead an army into Spain for the recovery of supposed relics than he would organize an expedition against the inhabitants of the moon, everybody now knows. But in the time when these songs were written anachronisms and improbabilities, even impossibilities, were matters of slight concern with writers, while those who should read or sing their songs cared as little for such, as they, and perhaps if they had been so disposed would have been quite unable to detect the fault. Those songs, accordingly, bristled with the unhistorical, even while, in a sort, they pretended to be history; as did the legends of King Arthur himself under mediæval handling. Those Knights of the Round Table, in Sir John Mallory's version, for example, are made to figure in the legend centuries before any order of knighthood had been instituted, while in the exploits described the rude garniture of a British chief is changed into the complete iron panoply of a mediæval warrior, and he challenges his enemy in the pompous phrases of the tilt-yard.

With such instances before us we understand readily how in primitive times the original germ of fact in the heart of a tradition would become hidden away under fold after fold of mere invention. The mediæval tradition exhibits utter recklessness as to historical consistency; the primitive tradition reveals a lack of consciousness that such consistency has any existence, and a complete confusion of ideas as to truth and fable. It deals with what belongs to the realm of the supernatural in the same way, bringing deities upon the scene wherever they are needed in the exigencies of the story, or to intensify its elements of wonder and surprise.

An instance of the kind now in question is furnished in the fourth chapter of Prof. Lenormant's work before mentioned. That the first great crime in the annals of the human race should make a deep impression, and leave its traces in the traditions of the centuries following, was eminently natural. It was, indeed, a terrific incident, the death of innocent, unoffending Abel by the hand

of his own brother, an amazing fact, occurring when it could not fail to be seen in vivid contrast with the peaceful, holy and happy life of the lost Eden. Subsequent like deeds, however familiar and common in the growing degeneracy of the race they might have become, would never lessen the criminal pre-eminence of this, and the first murder would be remembered and rehearsed even when other and equally brutal ones would be forgotten.

Associated in a certain way with this, as Lenormant shows, was the building of the first city; since of Cain the record is first made that he "builded a city, and called it after the name of his son." The fourth chapter in Lenormant's book traces what he claims as the survival of traditions of these two associated events in subsequent centuries,—traditions among various races, Accadian, Chaldæan, Phœnician, Greek and Roman down to the familiar story of the slaying of Remus by his brother Romulus, as the foundations of the Roman city were being laid. There may be critics who will pronounce some things in the chapter fanciful; but upon the whole the theory seems to be fairly well made out, that in the various myths noticed, the tradition of that first great crime, associated with the first achievement in the building of cities, appears and reappears, under strange guises often, yet always capable of decipherment. It is tradition, and myth, *founded on history*, or on fact, but still by no means history.

This branch of the question as to the relation of tradition to history will be resumed and concluded in a second article.

---

## THE CHARACTER OF PATRIARCHAL HISTORY.

BY PROFESSOR FRANZ DELITZSCH.

Translated from "Commentar Ueber Genesis" by Rev. L. D. Temple, B. A.,  
Morgan Park, Ill.

Gen. XI., 26-32 is the threshold of patriarchal history. Did this account lie before us portrayed by the pencil of a profane writer, its tone would appear entirely different. The Migration with which it begins was not merely a family event,—it was the beginning and perhaps already a period of a race movement which has made a deep impression upon the lauds of the Mediterranean Sea. But the Sacred Scripture has only a subordinate interest in the ethnographical background of this history,—her chief aim is the progressive realization of the divine plan of redemption. Hence it happens that the significance of the narrative for the history of races and nations retires from the foreground though it is never veiled in complete obscurity; and that the narrative appears individualized and limited to families rather more than in reality it was, since with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob an increasingly wide stream of human kind begins an onward movement.

A new epoch in redemptive history is now begun. The call of Abraham and his immigration into the land of promise is its basis. Among epochs of redemptive history it is the third. Let us look at both of the former that we may understand the peculiarity of this. The development which God purposed for mankind was disturbed by sin, as an act of free self-determination against God. That was the first incision in the history. God now gives to man the promise of mercy

in the victory of the woman's seed over evil; but the ruin by sin becomes universal and requires a general judgment,—that was the second incision in the history. Likewise in the post-diluvian race of men which escaped the doom of the rest, sin threatened to attain again a general dominion, but God averted this by the confusion of tongues. In consequence of this there arises a multitude of races and of religions as well which darken the idea of the one spiritual, absolute being of God by national, local and sensuous limitation. Now if God do not again interfere, mankind will degenerate into paganism. Neither the recollections which were carried with them into the dispersion nor the law upon their hearts were adequate to insure a continuance of the true knowledge and government of God. If God however intend so to interfere his redemptive revelation must be united with a single race. This race is in preparation while Abraham is being isolated from his connection with the world of the time. The selection of him, his rescue from paganism (Isa. XXIX., 22) is the third incision in the history,—the beginning of its national, theocratic direction. The confusion of tongues is the crisis preparing for this new incision, since the division of races which had taken place made it essential that one race be entrusted with the saving revelation on behalf of all. Israel became this race of redemption and Abraham (Mal. II., 15; comp. Ez. XXXIII., 24; Heb. XI., 12) the one living rock from which it was hewn. While therefore in Israel, redemption is being developed toward that point where it can break through ethnic limitations, other races go their own way. But God does not leave himself to them *ἀμάστρον* (Act. XIV., 16). They were preserved and upborne by the gracious covenant made with all descendants of Noah. Even their alienation from God according to Act. XVII., 27 was a discipline leading to Christ. All that was great and glorious which paganism produced was not lost when at last, being sanctified, it entered into the service of the kingdom of God and became a consecrated gift upon the altar of the Lord.

The history of the Patriarchs is thus the early history of Israel; and not one of a group of traditions which arose in political tendency for the justification and glorifying of the Jewish (Abraham) and Ephraimitish (Jacob) kingdoms. This Bernstein proposes as a new critical discovery in his paper: "Source of the traditions of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," (1871). He deals with the early history of Israel just as Redslob with the history of Jesus wherein he sees picture-lessons of a *disciplina arcæni* relative to care of souls and Church order. Nöldecke likewise applies to Abraham his statement that the derivation of families and races from individual parents is an incorrect representation. Yet he regards him as a person and not, as Dozy with reference to Isa. LI., 1, as a personified stone. We imagine ourselves as no less rational in considering him the tribal father of Israel. The early history of the redemptive race completes itself in three forward movements. In the three Patriarchs its development advances steadily. Abraham is the *πίνα ἀγία* of Israel, Isaac the son of promise,—Jacob-Israel the father of the twelve from whom the people of promise spring.

The *Toledoth* of the three Patriarchs constitute three circles which lie adjacent and somewhat overlap. Since the contents of all three comprise family history, all basic relations of the ancient house are represented there. The house of the Patriarchs is in all respects the typical house of Israel. As the peculiarities of the child may be traced in the face and features of the parents and grandparents so the character and family life of the Patriarchs image forth the character and race-life of Israel. What the Patriarchs were by nature and became by grace is

repeated in the natural and spiritual life of Israel. While history advances simple family relations become evident as types of the future,—but what they teach, reaching beyond their simplest meaning, is not morals alone, but important realities in the history of redemption. That such is the case is the result of a providential connection by virtue of which the race history of Israel links itself to the family history of the Patriarchs, much as the outer and larger annual layers of a tree's trunk encase the inner and smaller.

In Israel a nation was to be established for the good of all. This nation did not have its origin in the usual way, like the others, but was derived from the ground of miracle and organized by the power and mercy of Jehovah. Therefore in patriarchal history everything proceeds contrary to human expectancy and thought. Its essential nature is the promise gainsaying the appearance of the existing. It is a divine dealing apparently entering into contradiction with itself. Morally viewed it is the period of the exercise of faith. Faith that grasps the word of promise and thereon arrays the seen against the unseen, the present against the future, and then, for the love of God, severs itself from the dearest object. This feature of faith is fundamental in the Patriarchs. In Abraham it appears in the entire and mighty fulness of all its separate tendencies. Abraham is a type of the war of faith, the victory of faith, the obedience of faith. Therefore he is *πατήρ πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων*. In Isaac Abraham's loving patience reappears,—in Jacob, Abraham's hopeful wrestling. *Ἐπ' ἐλπίδι παρ' ἐλπίδα* is the motto which all three might have chosen. Abraham is already hoary, and Sara is barren; and yet she is to become a mother. Isaac is to continue Abraham's family line and yet the latter is to sacrifice him. In this way were the Patriarchs educated away from their pagan origin and their untrained disposition. In this way, not self-working, but following the lead of the divine working they become ancestors of Israel and the living basic rock of a new age. In this way promise and faith become the two correlated factors in the people of God. "In the midst of toil and resignation to things as they were their life passed away. In hope Israel is conceived and born and dressed. Therefore the true life movement of Israel is hope. Aspiration is Israel's element." In harmony with its true life Israel does not live in the hour now present being full of enigmas and contradictions, but in the hour to come made present now through faith.

If we view the time of the Patriarchs from the goal and central point of the history of redemption, which is that of God's self revelation in his Christ made in the fulness of time, the position which it assumes in the development of redemptive history is thereby determined as follows:

The first step in the history of redemption is the antediluvian period, both in and out of Eden. God is here immediately present with men in the visibility of a spiritual body. Even when through sin the fall had separated and estranged God and man, Jehovah still walked among men in solicitous and compassionate love; and the pious, like Enoch, walk with Him. His cherubim throne stands on the east side of Eden. For mankind Eden is now westward,—there where the sun sinks in evening red is the scene of the aforesaid God-communion now lost. From that point men turned westward their longing gaze which since Noah has been directed heavenwards. Since the judgment of the flood God has withdrawn into Heaven in order henceforth to reveal himself from thence in judgment and blessing. It cannot, however, remain so. All human aspiration henceforth unites in the sigh: "Oh that thou wouldst rend the Heavens and come down."

Isa. LXIII., 19. The end toward which history now strives is that God shall again make his abode among men. "The Shekina," says an old Midrash (Tanchuma 129b of the Vienna ed.), "abode originally here below,—after Adam's fall it withdrew ever deeper and deeper into Heaven and with Abraham began its gradual return." We know wherein this return of God to man culminated. Viewed from this elevation the post-diluvian history of redemption appears as a road, now ascending and now descending which on the whole leads ever higher and in the end reaches the summit.

The second stage in redemptive history is the time of the Patriarchs. In this period God again appears as present in a personal and even in a visible manner upon earth, yet only in a similitude. This is somewhat veiled, usually communicated through angels, only at irregular times and then only to the Patriarchs, these few holy men. They live to see manifestations of God which are similitudes of the former and types of the future. God suffers himself again to be seen here below, but only mediately and by a chosen few. By these only seldom and at points in their life significant in redemptive history and even then in the deepest mystery. From Jacob to Moses these revelations cease entirely and God makes himself known only mediately in the way of providence and blessing. In this ever-increasingly quiet interval revelation ceases more and more. But the descending roadway, which disappears at last entirely from sight, comes into view again at the end of this interval leading the more directly upward. In the time of Moses, God breaks forth anew from his long retirement and concealment. This epoch is like no other Old Testament period compared with it. It reveals God in the singularity of his name יהוה, as the eternal and, at the same time, as the historical being. It is the period of the completed origin of Israel, and of deliverance for his own people beginning,—the initial period of prophetic inspiration and of miracle wrought through human agency.

The third stage of redemptive history is the pre-exilic Jewish period. Herein God reveals himself as personal and visible; not to a few individuals as in the time of the Patriarchs, but to an entire nation; not occasionally only, but continuously. Nevertheless it was to a single nation only, and not yet to mankind. Within this stage two epochs are to be distinguished whose relation is a diverging one. In the first epoch Israel is led by the angel of Jehovah. In the cloud and fiery pillar Jehovah leads Israel forth. The token of the presence hovers above the tabernacle, standing by its entrance when it rests. This is the glorious epoch of the wilderness-presence of God, beholden not only by one here and there, but by entire Israel. It was the period when a nation began to be,—when therefore unusual proof was given of mercy. Although Israel was still of untamed disposition, it was nevertheless the period of their first love, when Jehovah followed them through the desert as though they had been a faithful bride,—the time which He has never forgotten and never will forget. (Jer. II., 2.) In the sphere of such self-revelation of God Israel did not continue, because Israel did not in-trench itself upon the love of its God, but in its own untamed disposition. If we take our stand at the end of the Solomonic period we see that in place of the wilderness-presence of God, visible to the entire nation, a limited and more mediate presence has come in. The second epoch is that of the Temple-presence and of the Word-presence in Israel. For Israel He is present in the Temple, but only through the mediation of the priests,—for Israel He is present in the Word, but only through the mediation of the prophets. The people in their entirety are now

no longer vouchsafed a view of their God as in the Mosaico-judicial period of the deliverance. God sits upon a throne above the Cherubim of the ark of the Covenant behind a double curtain and only the high priest once a year has access hither. Or He draws nigh to the lonely prophet, speaks words to him in ear and heart, reveals himself to him in visions,—all this in supernatural more than in personal self-attestation. Many indeed see in this a progress since the more invisible and mediate the communication of God with men, the more spiritual and internal it becomes. Yet according to Scripture this is of highest worth, not that God communicate himself to the spirit of man, but that the entire man gaze upon God. The progressive lapse of the second epoch confirms this view. The ripener for judgment Israel become, the more numerous become the prophets. The more active and mansided the Word-presence of God in Israel appears, the more the multitude of Israel is repelled. The Temple-presence, however,—this presence of God that is promise-like, comes to an end as Israel completes the measure of its sin. Ezechiel sees the glory of Jehovah depart by degrees from the Temple,—a proof that it is now devoted to destruction, and priesthood and people to judgment. It is the second time that God withdraws his visible presence from the earth. The first time he withdrew from mankind in order to destroy them by the flood,—the second time from the Jewish race to expose Jerusalem to destruction and the people to exile. As the first stage of redemptive history closes with a judgment from the departed God,—as the second is at least lost in deep and protracted silence,—so the third ends like the first. Both times the living God enthroned upon the cherubim breaks off his residence here. The people of the exile were hereafter made to depend on the prophetic Word-presence alone. They became accustomed in the exercise of faith to hide themselves in the invisible. But they were not wont to forget that the termination of His abode in Israel was a retributive judgment.

The fourth stage of redemptive history, the post-exilic Israelitish period in its beginning is not really different from the exilic which closes the third stage. The people had prophets; and through Haggai, with reference to this presence of His, communicated through the prophets, Jehovah says (H., 5): **רוחי עִמָּדָת** “My spirit remaineth among you.” But in the Temple there were wanting the ark of the Covenant, the Caphoreth, the Cherubim, the Urim and Thummim, the fire from Heaven, the holy anointing oil; and that which was most important, the Shekina,—the gracious presence of Jehovah visible to the high priest who entered into the most holy place,—this was wanting also. But even the divine Word-presence and the manifold evidences of the **רוח הקודש** did not long continue. With Malachi and Daniel prophecy also became dumb. The period immediately after the exile seemed to promise a fresh blossoming of the glorious past. The Mosaic period of deliverance, semblance-like, seemed to revive. But instead of this the people had only too soon to complain: “We see not our signs,—there is no more any prophet.” (Ps. LXXIV., 9.) When the tribe of Simeon named Jonathan brother of Maccabi as *ἡγούμενος καὶ ἀρχιερεὶς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, so it continued *ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν* (1 Macc. XIV., 41). In abandonment like this on the part of God this fourth stage of redemptive history, the last before the fulness of the times, runs on to a conclusion. It is for them in Israel that believe a school of aspiration, away from the trivial commonplace and rambling notion play of the theology of that time toward

the reunveiling of the divine countenance. Then at last appeared the advent from on high. Jehovah visited His long abandoned people. In that mystery (*Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*) which was then unveiled became realized in for transcending glory the counterpart of Eden.

The fifth stage in redemptive history, the period of the journeyings of Christ in this world (*αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς σαρκός*) is the completer, surpassing return of the first. In the first stage God was enthroned with men and walked among them,—now it is true in a most real and eternally valid sense that *ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν* for Israel alone closely beheld him that became man. It is an exception when the heathen receive streams of his glorious mercy. The hour wherein he will exhibit himself to the Greeks has not yet come. Israel is first to enjoy that mercy-visit of their God which was the theme of all their prophets. First his people will he save from their sins. But his own receive him not. They slay upon the cross him that appeared in the flesh. He that *ἐξ ἀσθενείας* died, rises *ἐκ δυνάμεως* and goes to Heaven. A signification for the Jewish race similar to that noticed by Ezechiel though enhanced has this ascension of God who had become man. He withdrew from the people that reviled him. "Ye will seek me," predicted he to them, John VII., 34, "and shall not find me and where I am there ye cannot come." He goes into Heaven, whither, by the side of God his father, no persecution of the Jewish race reaches and from whence no longing on their part brings him back. But just as Jehovah after he sat down upon His throne in the Heavens at the close of the first stage, brought about the judgment of the flood; and at the close of the third stage the judgment of the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of Judah,—so God and he that sits at his right hand relegate Jerusalem to destruction and Judah to an exile that still continues. He that departed hence, comes again, but in the fire of judgment and does not stay. Abandoned of God as ever, Israel move along in blindness until they shall greet with a better hosanna than the first the reappearing Savior from whom they are still alienated. For the faithful also the ascended one has come again, not yet in personal visibility neither in the fire of judgment, but in the fire of the spirit.

The sixth stage of redemptive history, the present stage that still continues, is the period of the spiritual presence of God and his Christ. This spiritual presence in the Church is more than the visible presence of Christ in the days of his flesh, because it has the resurrection of Christ for its forerunner. But it is less than the visible presence of the resurrected one because it is a provisional compensation for it. It is a preparation for it and will find therein its completion and fulfillment. It is not to be forgotten that the spirit of God which is sent by the glorified son of man is called *παράκλητος* because it comforts us in respect to the absent one. It is not to be forgotten that the aspiration of the Christian is directed toward being at home with Christ,—that all expectation of the whole Church unites in hope for his revelation. There is a great difference between the presence of Christ in glory, visible and revealed, and invisible and hidden. This difference must be the more sensible as in this sixth stage in which we find ourselves the spiritual presence has undeniably declined. Our time is like the second half of the post-exilic. As to its present poverty in the gifts of grace, the Church finds itself in the arid wilderness and must long for a return of the wonderful intensity and gracious fulness of the spiritual presence in the early Church. This wish will end in fulfillment

also in the third epoch of this stage,—the glorified period of the Church in this world.

But first the seventh stage of redemptive history which continues forever will bring to full realization all the aspiration of all the faithful from the beginning. It will also complete the transcending return of divine Edenic fellowship to be begun with the Parusia of God the Deliverer. The new Jerusalem spoken of in Rev. XXI., 3, *ἰδοὺ ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετ' ἀνθρώπων* is the counterpart of Eden. The fellowship of God with the first men who were *to be redeemed* has now changed into fellowship with all mankind who at last *are redeemed*. His presence is now no longer passing, changing, disappearing, but permanent, invariable, endless; not limited to a few and locally fixed, but all embracing and all penetrating; not invisible but visible; not in the form of a servant but in glory unveiled. No more does God withdraw skyward, for sin is forever condemned and earth is changed to Heaven. No more does he descend earthward, for the work of redemption is completed. The entire creation celebrates an eternal Sabbath. In it God rests and it rests in God. Jehovah has completed his work and Elohim is now all in all (*πάντα ἐν πᾶσι*).

---

### ➤GENERAL NOTES.◀

**The Library at Nineveh.**—In order to understand the position to which we must assign the legends of early Chaldaea, it is necessary to give some account of the literature of the Ancient Babylonians and their copyists, the Assyrians. As has been already stated, the fragments of burnt brick on which these legends are inscribed were found in the débris which covers the palaces called the South West Palace and the North Palace at Kouyunjik; the former building being of the age of Sennacherib, the latter belonging to the time of Assur-bani-pal. The tablets, which are of all sizes, from one inch long to over a foot square, are generally in fragments, and in consequence of the changes which have taken place in the ruins, the fragments of the same tablet are sometimes scattered widely apart. They were originally deposited, it would seem, in one of the upper chambers of the palace, from which they fell on the destruction of the building. In some of the lower chambers the whole floor has been found covered with them, in other cases they lay in groups or patches on the pavement, and there are occasional clusters of fragments at various heights in the earth which covers the ruins. Other fragments are scattered singly through all the upper earth which covers the floors and walls of the palace. Different fragments of the same tablet or cylinder are found in separate chambers which have no immediate connection with each other, showing that their present distribution has nothing to do with the original position of the tablets of which they formed part.

The inscriptions show that the tablets were arranged according to their subjects. Stories or subjects were continued on other tablets of the same size and form as those on which they were commenced, in some cases the number of tablets in a series and on a single subject amounting to over one hundred.

Each subject or series of tablets had a title, the title consisting of the first phrase or part of a phrase in it. Thus, the series of Astrological tablets, num-



bering over seventy tablets, bore the title "When the gods Anu (and) Bel," this being the commencement of the first tablet. At the end of every tablet in each series was written its number in the work, thus: "the first tablet of 'When the gods Anu, Bel,'" "the second tablet of 'When the gods Anu, Bel,'" &c., &c.; and, further, to preserve the proper position of each tablet, every one except the last in a series had at the end a catch phrase, consisting of the first line of the following tablet. There were besides catalogues of these documents written like them on clay tablets and other small oval tablets with titles upon them, apparently labels for the various series of works. All these arrangements show the care taken with respect to literary matters. There were regular libraries or chambers, probably on the upper floors of the palaces, appointed for the reception of the tablets, and custodians or librarians to take charge of them. These regulations were all of great antiquity, and like the tablets had a Babylonian origin.

Judging from the fragments discovered, it appears probable that there were in the Royal Library at Nineveh over 10,000 inscribed tablets, treating of almost every branch of knowledge existing at the time.—*From Smith's Chaldean Account of Genesis.*

---

#### The Seventh Day.—

"Thus the heavens were finished, and the earth, and all the host of them.

And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made and rested on the seventh day from all the work which he had made.

And God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, for in it he rested from all his work which God had created and made."

Now begins the seventh day, the day of rest, or the *Sabbath* of the earth, when the globe and its inhabitants are completed.

Since the beginning of this day no new creation has taken place. God rests as the Creator of the visible universe. The forces of nature are in that admirable equilibrium which we now behold, and which is necessary to our existence. No more mountains or continents are formed, no new species of plants or animals are created. Nature goes on steadily in its wonted path. All movement, all progress has passed into the realm of mankind, which is now accomplishing its task.

The seventh day is, then, the present age of our globe; the age in which we live; and which was prepared for the development of mankind. The narrative of Moses seems to indicate this fact; for at the end of each of the six working days of creation we find an *evening*. But the morning of the seventh is not followed by any *evening*. The day is still open. When the evening shall come the last hour of humanity will strike.

This view of the Sabbath of creation has been objected to, on account of the form of the command of the Decalogue, relating to the observance of the Sabbath. But those who object, confound God's Sabbath with man's Sabbath, and forget the words of Christ, that our Sabbath was made for man, who needs it, and not for God. God rests as a Creator of the material world only to become active, nay, Creator in the spiritual world. His Sabbath work is one of love to man—the redemption. His creation is that of the new man, born anew of the Spirit, in the heart of the natural man. So man is commanded to imitate God in

leaving once in seven days the work of this material world, to turn all his attention and devote his powers to the things of heaven.

There are, therefore, three Sabbaths :

1. God's Sabbath, after the material creation.
2. The Sabbath of humanity, the promised millennium, after the toil and struggle of the six working days of history.
3. The Sabbath of the individual, short-lived man, the day of rest of twenty-four hours, made for him according to his measure.

The length of the day in each is of no account. The plan, in all, is the same, and contains the same idea—six days of work and struggle in the material world, followed by a day of peace, of rest from the daily toil, and of activity in the higher world of the spirit. For the Sabbath is not only a day of rest, it is the day of the Lord.—*From Guyot's Creation.*

**A Projected Railway in Palestine.**—For a year past there have been rumors of a negotiation on the part of bankers in Beirut, probably with the aid of bankers in Constantinople, as the result of which it is finally announced that the Sultan—in consideration of a handsome royalty, equivalent to a large land tax—has leased to them the Plain of Esdraelon, with the condition that he shall protect it from the incursions of the Bedaween; and that, as a part of the agreement, they receive a concession for a railway. Accordingly they propose to turn their large acquisition to account by the construction of a railway from Acre to Damascus, which would strike directly across the Plain of Esdraelon. It is suggested that there might be a station for Nazareth (!), though it would pass twelve miles south of the town, which might be approached still nearer by a branch road to the foot of the Galilean Hills; while the main line, descending the valley of Jezreel, would “pass over the Jordan,” near an old Roman bridge, part of which is still standing and in use. Mr. Laurence Oliphant, an authority in all matters relating to the East, writing from Haifa, says: “Near this ancient Roman bridge of three arches, which is used to this day by the caravans of camels which bring the produce of the Hauran to the coast, the new railway bridge will cross the Jordan, probably the only one in the world which will have for its neighbor an actual bridge in use which was built by the Romans—thus, in this new, semi-barbarous country, bringing into close contact an ancient and a modern civilization.” From the point of crossing the Jordan, the railway would keep along its bank till it diverged farther to the East to skirt the hills that rise on the shore of the Sea of Galilee. In its route to Damascus it would traverse the Hauran, one of the richest agricultural regions in the East, the produce of which, no longer borne on the backs of camels, could now be carried, not only more swiftly, but in immensely greater bulk [one freight train would transport more than a dozen caravans] to the Mediterranean.

This would be indeed a commercial revolution in the Holy Land. But that is not the end. Still grander projects have been suggested, such as that of a canal which should rival the Suez Canal, or of a longer railroad, which should furnish another route to India besides that through Egypt. The late war awakened England to the absolute necessity, in order to preserve her Indian Empire, of a means of communication with it which cannot be interrupted or destroyed. While it is proposed to construct a second Suez Canal, the question

is asked if there may not be another water-way from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea; and engineers searching along the coast of Syria have suggested that it would be possible to make another Port Said at Haifa, just above the head of Mount Carmel, from which a canal might be carried across the Plain of Esdraelon to the Jordan, and down its valley to the Dead Sea, from which a canal could be cut across the desert to Akaba, where it would strike the other arm of the Red Sea from that reached by the Suez Canal.

Such a line it is easy to draw on the map, but to the execution of the project there is one great natural difficulty, in the depression of the Dead Sea, which is thirteen hundred feet below the level of the Mediterranean. The same difficulty would not be experienced in constructing a railroad, which, if not as effective for commerce, would answer equally well for subduing and civilizing the country. Before the Bedaween can be civilized they must be governed; and to be governed they must be subdued; and to be subdued they must be reached. The first thing is to get at them. An army cannot be transported across the desert on camels. The Arabs would fly faster than the army could follow, only to return as soon as it was gone. But with a railroad reaching to the Gulf of Akaba, troops could easily be transported to within striking distance of the most powerful tribes. As the Pacific railroads are settling the Indian question, so railroads across the desert may yet settle the Arab question.

But the project of a canal is the more captivating to the imagination, and it is hard to say to modern engineers that anything is impossible. This is an age of the world when the wildest anticipations of the past are exceeded by the realities of the present, and when it is but in natural course of things, that young men should dream dreams and old men should see visions. It would seem indeed like a dream of prophecy fulfilled, if we could see the ships of modern commerce gathering on that coast from which the ancient Phenicians carried commerce and civilization to Greece and Italy and Spain; and passing under the shadow of Carmel, enter the calm waters of an artificial river, and unfold their sails, the white wings of peace, over a plain which has been for ages the battle-field of nations; then dropping slowly down into the Valley of the Jordan, and crossing the Plain of Jericho, (from which, but for the depression, the voyager might see the domes and towers of Jerusalem,) pass through the Dead Sea, under the shadow of the mountains of Moab, and over the buried cities of the Plain, without disturbing the dead of Sodom and Gomorrah; and moving silently as "painted ships upon a painted ocean," across the solemn stillness of the desert, come at last to Akaba, and make a port of the ancient Ezion-geber, from which sailed the fleets of Solomon! What a dream! Yet it may be, for things more wonderful have been. By some such means perhaps the Eastern question is to be solved. May we not at least hope for it, and look for it? Is it presumption to pray that this generation may not pass away until this dream shall be fulfilled?—From *Field's "Among the Holy Hills."*

→CONTRIBUTED NOTES←

**The Tree of the Field : Deut. XX., 19.**—In the English version of the Old Testament, in the middle of the verse a parenthetical sentence appears as follows : “ *For the tree of the field is man’s life.* ” It will be noticed that the word *life* is in italics, which indicate that it does not appear in the original. This parenthesis has occasioned great difficulty to translators and interpreters. Read literally, it seems to have but little connection with the context : *Because the man the tree of the field.* Accordingly it has been concluded either that something must be mentally supplied, or that there is some error in the Hebrew text as we now have it. Those translators who accept these positions may be named as follows :

I. The authorized version supplies *life* and translates *The tree of the field is man’s life.* The objections to this are : (1) That it supplies an idea which is not clearly suggested by the context. True the statement is made in the same verse “ *from it thou eatest,* ” and yet no small distinction lies between this thought and the one which the English translators suggest. (2) It violates the normal arrangement of the sentence by making the subject, the predicate. This would only be done when the predicate was to be made emphatic. If it were desired by the writer to draw the attention of the reader to the fact that the tree of the field is a *man*, then that word would rightly have been put before the subject.

II. The marginal reading in the authorized version removes the parenthesis and, regarding the sentence as a direct address, translates “ *for, O man, the tree of the field is to be employed in the siege.* ” Here a distinction is recognized between the fruit tree, the tree which is good for food, the tree which grows in the vicinity of the city, mentioned in the preceding part of the same verse and in the following one,—and the tree of the field which is presumably not a fruit-bearing one. This class of trees Moses permits the Israelites to use in building their siege works. The objections to this are (1) that Moses passes too abruptly from his previous method of address into this somewhat violent form. “ *O man* ” is not in the Mosaic style certainly. (2) That it violates the Massoretic accentuation.

III. Another class of translators confess their inability to obtain any adequate sense from the passage as it now stands and hence would make a change, or changes, in the text.

1. The Septuagint, representing no small class of interpreters, changes the pointing of the article preceding the word “ *man,* ” so that the Hebrew will read *hē* (הֵ) instead of *hā* (הָ) and renders accordingly, “ *For is the tree of the field a man to come before thee into the siege?* ”

2. Others infer that a negative idea is contained in the expression and render freely like the Vulgate : “ *Since it is a tree and not a man, nor can it increase the number of thy enemies.* ” The objections to both these translations are, (1) They convict Moses of giving utterance to a somewhat “ *puerile and irrelevant* ” sentiment. Everyone knows that a tree is not a man and such a reason would be of no value as an argument against cutting down trees. (2) This also inverts the sentence, making the predicate the subject. (3) The first rendering introduces a violent change in construction and the second has not more than a shade of reason for supplying a negation.

3. De Wette and others propose to substitute for the letter of the article *hā*

(ה) the preposition lāmēdh (ל) and accordingly read "Because for man is the tree of the field." The distinction must here be made as before mentioned between the ordinary tree and the fruit tree or else this rendering fails to give any adequate sense. It is preferable not to make such a change in the text unless it becomes absolutely necessary.

4. Another critic would transfer to hā'ādham (*man*) the athnāh or disjunctive accent which now, being under תִּכְרֹת (tīkhrōth) "cut," separates the sentence at that point, and make the introductory particle כִּי (ki) adversative. He would then read as follows: "Thou shalt not cut them (i. e., the trees) but the men. The tree of the field is to come before thee in the siege. Such a translation is ingenious but too forced to command any general assent.

In gathering up the materials for a tolerably satisfactory translation of this passage it may be inferred: (1) That some error in transcription has crept into the text, for none of the proposed renderings are really satisfactory. (2) That the difficulty lies in the words "the man," or in Hebrew הָאָדָם. The word may have been לְאָדָם, i. e., for man, or הָאָדָם, i. e., is man, or some other similarly sounding consonants. הָאָדָם is almost incomprehensible. (3) The distinction between the trees near the city which supply fruit for food and the tree of the field seems plausible, and if it can be sustained will help greatly in the correct exegesis of the passage.

The translation which in our judgment accords best with the context, and which is open to fewer objections is this: "When thou besiegest a city many days in making war upon it, to capture it, thou shalt not destroy the trees by bringing an ax against them, for from them thou shalt eat, and thou shalt not cut them down, but for man is the tree of the field to bring before thee in the siege."

G. S. GOODSPEED.

**The Tenses of the Second Psalm.**—In order that a clearer view of the Psalm as a whole may be gained, the Authorized Version is given, arranged however according to the Parallelism; and for the sake of comparison, there is placed side by side with it the translation of Rev. T. K. Cheyne, published in the "Book of Psalms," Parchment Library.

An examination of the verbal forms, with special reference to the tenses discloses the following facts:—

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Why do the heathen rage,<br>and the people imagine a vain thing?   | Wherefore do the nations throng together,<br>and the peoples meditate vanity?  |
| 2. The kings of the earth set themselves,<br>and the rulers take counsel together,<br>against the LORD, and against his Anointed, | The kings of the earth stand forth,<br>and the rulers take counsel together,<br>against Jehovah and against [his anointed: |
| 3. "Let us break their bands asunder,<br>and cast away their cords from us.   | "Let us tear off their bonds," (say they),<br>"and cast from us their cords."  |
| 4. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh:<br>the Lord shall have them in derision.   | He who is seated in the heavens laughs,<br>The Lord mocks at them.   |
| 5. Then shall he speak to them in his wrath,<br>and vex them in his sore displeasure.   | Then speaks he unto them in his anger,<br>and in his hot wrath confounds them:   |
| 6. Yet have I set my King<br>upon my holy hill of Zion.   | "... When I have established my king<br>upon Zion my holy mountain."   |

- |  |                              |   |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| 7. I will declare the decree:<br>the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my<br>this day have I begotten thee.   | [Son;<br>Thou art my<br>son, | " I will relate a decree:<br>Jehovah said unto me, Thou art my son,<br>I have this day begotten thee.                             |
| 8. Ask of me, and I shall give thee<br>the heathen for thine inheritance,<br>and the uttermost parts of the earth for  | [thy possession.             | Ask of me and I will grant thee<br>nations for thine inheritance, [slon.<br>and the earth's utmost parts for thy posses-          |
| 8. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron;<br>thou shalt dash them in pieces like a pot-   | [ter's vessel.               | Thou shalt break them with a mace of iron;<br>thou shalt shiver them like a potter's ves-   |
| 10. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings:<br>be instructed, ye judges of the earth.   |                              | Now therefore, ye kings, deal wisely;<br>be admonished ye judges of the earth.  |
| 11. Serve the LORD with fear,<br>and rejoice with trembling.   |                              | Serve Jehovah with fear,<br>and testify awe with trembling.   |
| 12. Kiss the Son,<br>lest he be angry, and ye perish from the<br>when his wrath is kindled but a little. [him.<br>Blessed are all they that put their trust in | [way,                        | Kiss the Son,<br>lest he be angry, and ye go to ruin,<br>for his anger kindles easily:<br>happy are those who take refuge in him! |

1. "*Do rage*" of v. 1 is a Perfect, while "*imagine*" is an Imperfect. The thought then is (1) why have they gathered together tumultuously, what has occasioned this outbreak; and (2) what is the aim, the design (referring to the future) which they have before them? In short, (1) what has caused this outbreak, and (2) what do they hope to accomplish by it? The translation of both tenses by the present obscures the sense.

2. "*Set themselves*" of v. 2 is an Imperfect, while "*take counsel together*" is a Perfect. The first verb, therefore, describes vividly the hostile array as *seen* by the writer: They are standing forth, taking a defiant position. The second verb, however, describes something which had taken place before the mustering of the forces to battle, viz., the deliberation, the conspiracy, the confederacy. The sense, then, is: Kings are taking their stand in battle, Rulers have formed a conspiracy.

3. "*Shall laugh*," "*shall have them in derision*" of v. 4 and "*shall speak*" and "*vez*" of v. 5 are Imperfects; but we have seen that the Imperfect is not necessarily *future*. The primary reference here, if the Psalm is interpreted typically, is to a rebellion already begun, against the king which God has placed on Israel's throne. In this case our *present* would better express the thought. If the Psalm is interpreted exclusively of the Messiah, the use of the *present* is more consistent with the preceding tenses. Jehovah, while the rebellion is in progress, is represented as *laughing, deriding, speaking angrily, confounding*. This is Jehovah's attitude not at some future time, but while the rebellion is in progress.

4. "*Have established*" of v. 6 is a Perfect. The king had been placed upon the throne before the outbreak of the rebellion. Cheyne's translation is good: [what impiety is this] *when I have established*, etc.

The remaining verbal forms of this Psalm are chiefly Imperfects with strictly future meaning (since at this point the king quotes a decree spoken at some earlier date by Jehovah, which, of course, had exclusive reference to the *future*), and Imperatives. Only one perfect occurs *I have begotten*, which evidently refers to the immediate past, the sense being: "This day I have declared and manifested thee to be my son."  
R.

→EDITORIAL NOTES←

**The Study of Biblical History.**—There is, on the part of many ministers and of students preparing for the ministry, a lamentable ignorance of the most common characters and events of Bible History. That Abraham lived before Moses is generally known, but how long before, or the commonly accepted date of either of these Old Testament worthies *many*, if called upon outside of their study, would be unable to declare. The names of David and Solomon are familiar to all, but of the kings of either Israel or Judah, after the division, many are totally ignorant. Isaiah and Jeremiah may be friends, but the Minor Prophets are entire strangers to them. The Old Testament history, as related in Joshua, Judges, the Books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles is far less familiar to them than the history of Rome and Greece. Some of these men read philosophy and study science, but have no time for the study of God's dealings with his chosen people, a study from which more help might be derived than from any other single source. These men do not have, and indeed cannot have, any conception of the wealth of homiletical material here to be found. Nor is this strange. The study of *Biblical History* is not sufficiently emphasized. Colleges and universities in which the history of the nations, ancient and modern, is taught even in the most minute details, pass over contemptuously the history of that race by which the world's history has been most influenced and most benefited. Theological seminaries, founded for the purpose of training men in the knowledge of God, his Word, and his dealings with men, discuss deeply the question as to whether, in fact, God is knowable, spend much time in deciding whether the Bible is, after all, the word of God, and study minutely the history and causes of every heresy that has sprung up since Christianity was established, while God, as manifested in his Word, and the Word as giving God's ideas to men, or as a text-book of Old Testament Church-history are ignored. Ministers, the sons of godly parents, trained in Bible lore from childhood, know the Bible, and Bible-history. But men converted late in life, who have not enjoyed the advantages of this early training, in many cases go through their ministry ignorant of that which is most easily obtained, and of which, when obtained, would have served them to better purpose than all else that has been gained.

Should there not be a place for the study of Old Testament History in the college? Should not a most thorough acquaintance with it be required in the Divinity School? Should not ministers, who to-day are for the most part ignorant of all this set themselves to work in this line, and, perhaps, let Darwinism, and such studies *rest* for a time?

**The Collection of Facts.**—That which is most needed at the present time in the science of Old Testament criticism is a faithful and patient collection of the facts. Theories without number are appearing, but a large proportion of them are easily shown to be insufficient and false, because they do not account for *all* the facts. They have been hastily deduced from a *few* facts. The history of the Natural sciences should be of great service to the Bible scientist. In the various domains of research wonderful results are at frequent intervals announced; new theories are confidently promulgated, while the old theories are

laid away, broken to pieces by some newly discovered facts. When the facts are all collected, then the theories can be confidently formulated and not before.

The science of Biblical criticism, in the department of the Old Testament, at least, has not yet passed through the period of collecting the facts.

Wide sweeping statements are made, broad generalizations are constantly indulged in; conclusions are quickly reached; but the question must ever be asked in the face of these, What are the real facts in the case? And just here is a work in which all interested in Old Testament study may engage.

It may require specialists to deduce theories, and to detect the full significance of the facts after they are gathered, but it does not necessarily require a specialist to gather them. Any one who knows a fact when he sees it may busy himself in looking them out, and his labor cannot be valueless.

Just this kind of work is now especially needed, in very many lines of investigation in Old Testament facts. It is but necessary that the investigator proceed intelligently with his work.

It is believed that THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT furnishes the best means, not only of indicating the fields of truth that should be searched, but also of making known the facts as they are discovered.

This is a mission which belongs especially to THE STUDENT. And it is not proposed to hold back the facts because they may not be such as were anticipated, or because they disprove views that have been long cherished.

Of course it is not intended that the STUDENT should contain nothing but the barest, baldest recital of facts. Various views are being gained and various theories formulated, and the truth or falseness of these cannot be more quickly nor more certainly determined than by exposing them to the light of public scrutiny.

The facts should be gathered, the truth should be known. And the pages of the STUDENT will be open to make public the results of those who are seeking to gain these. The STUDENT is a medium, not an advocate. This has been its purpose from the first. When it becomes an advocate for any special views, or theories of any man or set of men, an advocate in such a sense that it refuses to admit to its columns any arguments or facts opposing these views or theories, whether they be orthodox or heterodox, conservative or liberal, it will then, as a partial pleader, cease to be valuable to those who seek for facts, instead of arguments to substantiate a theory. Let the facts be known.

---

**The Overestimate of Criticism.**—There are those who forget that the results of Biblical Criticism are largely negative. Broad-minded scholars are not inclined to allow supremacy to any one line of Bible study. It is a danger to which specialists in any department are liable that they overestimate their own methods and results. Criticism has done much to broaden our minds, prune away manifest errors in our conceptions of Bible truth and to put the facts in a new light. But its results are not to pass unchallenged simply because in this line they may seem to be unassailable. The whole structure reared by the critics must stand also the tests of historical, philosophical and theological investigation. This idea was most admirably put in the recent article in these pages from the hand of Prof. Schodde, who made a strong plea for the theological study of the Old Testament. Biblical Criticism is a means. Care should be taken lest it become an end in itself. It seems to be the serious conclusion of some of these able investigators—



judging from their point of view—that almost the sole reason for the existence of the Bible is that the critics may exercise their wits upon it. Beware of setting your pyramid upon its apex.

---

→BOOKS & NOTICES.←

KADESH-BARNEA.\*

If on taking up this book the reader is surprised that so large a volume should be written on such a subject he has no such feeling on laying it down. Kadesh-Barnea is the key to the Israelitish wanderings. "To settle its whereabouts," says the author, "is to aid in settling the boundary stretch of Edom, or Seir; the locality of the wilderness of Paran; of the wilderness of Zin; of the Negeb or South Country; and to fix more definitely one of the homes of Abraham; the dwelling-place of rejected Hagar; the sites of mounts Hor and Halak; the site of Tamar; and the route of Kedor-la'omer." After examining all the Bible references to the place, he concludes that without exception they point directly to the heart of the 'Azâzimeh mountain tract or are conformable to it; and while there are no conclusive evidences of the precise location found in the Egyptian records, the Apocrypha, the rabbinical writings, or the early Christian name-lists—extra-Biblical sources of information which he has carefully examined—there is nothing in them which conflicts with the indications found in the Scriptures, but, on the contrary, there is more or less in confirmation of the same.

Dr. Trumbull next reviews later attempts at its identification, giving prominence to the discoveries and conclusions of Robinson and Rowlands. Then follows the author's interesting story of his own hunt for it. The obstacles in the way of visiting 'Ayn Qadees, the site for which Rowlands contended, were formidable. It was situated in the midst of the 'Azâzimeh Bed'ween, a violent tribe—"the most Ishmaelitish of Ishmaelites;" and this tribe greatly hated and were watchfully suspicious of the Teeyâhah, from whom our author must take his escort. But the Doctor had a combination of circumstances in his favor. The two shaykhs who were at the head of the mid-desert tribes, and who would have baffled the design of the travelers, had they accompanied them, were prevented from going, so that two young and more pliable shaykhs were obtained. At this time also some kinsmen of one of the old shaykhs were imprisoned at Jerusalem, and he was anxious for their release. The dragoman of Doctor T. skillfully took advantage of this by giving the Arab a flattering account of the influence his master had, and by showing the desirability of securing it on behalf of the prisoners. He also told the shaykh that this gentleman was editor of a paper in America which had a large circulation among the class most likely to make journeys to Sinai and Palestine, and that if he were well treated on the desert, he would speak favorably of the route on his return home, and so turn the current of pilgrimage in that direction. Thus it came about that Dr. Trumbull was permitted to take the route of his choice. In the person of his drago-

\* KADESH-BARNEA. Its importance and probable site with the story of a hunt for it, including studies on the route of the Exodus and the southern boundary of the Holy Land. By H. Clay Trumbull, D.D. Pp. 478. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884. Price \$5.00.

man he had an excellent helper. He was one eager for reputation, and upon the promise that his name should be put into the book that would be written, he used every effort to reach 'Ayn Qadees.

In the face of dangers, real and imaginary, they went from the main track, March 30, 1881; and early in the afternoon Dr. Trumbull claims to have come upon the site of Kadesh-Barnea. "Out from the barren and desolate stretch of the burning desert-waste we had come with magical suddenness into an oasis of verdure and beauty. . . . We seated ourselves in the delightful shades of one of the hills not far from the wells, and enjoyed our lunch, with the music of brook and bees and birds sounding pleasantly in our ears. Our Arabs seemed to feel the soothing influence of the place; and to have lost all fear of the 'Azâzimeh. . . . One thing was sure: all that Rowlands had said of this oasis was abundantly justified by the facts. . . . The sneers which other travelers had indulged in, over the creation of his heated fancies, were the result of their own lack of knowledge—and charity. And as to the name of the oasis, about which Robinson and others were so incredulous, it is Qadees (قدیس), as it was written for me in Arabic by my intelligent Arabic dragoman, a similar name to that of Jerusalem, El-Quds, the Holy; the equivalent of the Hebrew Kadesh."

The author next makes a comparison of sites, part of which are in or near the 'Arabah; and part on or a little north of the upper desert. 'Ayn El-Waybeh, near the upper end of the 'Arabah, and 'Ayn Qadees, on the level of the upper desert, and northward of the desert proper, are representative sites. He concludes that the claims for the former are baseless, and that the objections increase at every step. The most prominent objections to the latter he attributes to a misunderstanding, and hence a misrepresenting of the report of its earliest modern discoverer. In support of the claim that the site of Kadesh-Barnea is identified in 'Ayn Qadees it is urged that the region is a strategic stronghold on the southern border of Canaan; that it is the southernmost and central point of the obvious natural boundary line along that border; that it secures the identification of every other landmark along that dividing line; that it renders clear the movements of the Israelites toward, and away from, the southern limit of Canaan; and that its features and name correspond more nearly with the Bible references to Kadesh-Barnea than those of any other proposed site.

Following the treatment of the subject which gives the book its name there is a special study upon the route of the Exodus. As Kadesh-Barnea is the sanctuary stronghold that marks the boundary line between Canaan and Arabia, Shur is the wall that separates Arabia from Egypt. As the former is the key to the wanderings, the latter is the key to the Exodus. In the summing up several points are named as points now made clear. (1) This wall, known also by the names of Khetam and Etham, stood as a border barrier between the Delta and the desert, from the Mediterranean to the modern Gulf of Suez. The desert eastward was known as the Desert of Shur and the Desert of Etham. (2) Leading out of Egypt there was the Road of the Land of the Philistines, the Road of the Wall, and the Road of the Red Sea. (3) No city or town could have been a starting-point or stopping-place in the route of the Exodus; "hence the hope of determining that route by any discovery of the ruins of one town or another in Lower Egypt, is based on a misconception of both the letter and the general tenor of the Bible narrative. The Israelites started out from their scattered homes in the district of Rameses-Goshen, and made their general rendezvous at

Succoth, in an extensive camping-field along the line of lakes of which Lake Timsáh is the centre. Thence they moved forward toward the Great Wall, and encamped within it, at some point near the northernmost of the three roads desertward. From that camping-place they were turned southward nearly the entire length of the Isthmus, and made their final camp, before the Exodus, at a region bounded eastward by the western arm of the Red Sea, westward by a prominent watch-tower such as guarded each of the three roadways out of Egypt, northward by Hahiroth, and southward by an image or shrine of the Semitic Egyptian dualistic divinity Ba'al-Set." (4) After leaving Succoth there was no haste until the crossing of the sea. There is nothing in the text indicating but a day's journey between any two stations named as the great landmark camping-places. (5) The northernmost stretch of the western arm of the Red Sea was then practically at the present head of the Gulf of Suez. The last camping-field of the Israelites must have been near the northern shore of the Gulf, and the crossing of the sea must have been from that starting-point.

A careful reading of this volume, in connection with the accompanying maps, will give good returns for the time expended upon it. Dr. Trumbull has made a most wide and careful investigation of literature bearing upon the matters in hand. His points are well established as he advances, and the conclusions seem irresistible. The foot-notes and references to authorities are numerous, and serve as a guide to extensive research on the part of those disposed to make it. This volume forms a most valuable contribution to the literature of Biblical geography.

A. C. CHUTE.

#### QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.\*

This book, though having some valuable features, is, on the whole, decidedly disappointing. In the preface the author states the aim of the work to be: "to discuss all the quotations in the New Testament from the Old Testament and from other sources, to give the original texts with English translation, and as exact an explanation as possible of the various passages, so that the precise thought of the Old Testament may be set alongside of the use made of it in the New Testament, and the reader thus have all the material before him, and be able to draw his own conclusions." If the work had simply given us the texts collected together, as they are, in a simple and orderly way, and pointed out the existing differences, omitting the explanatory part altogether, its value would have been enhanced.

In the introduction, Prof. Toy claims that all the New Testament quotations are taken from the Septuagint, or from an oral Aramaic version, the existence of which he assumes rather than endeavors to establish.

The principle thought to underlie the exegetical method of the New Testament writers is stated in brief to be, that they were governed and controlled by the rabbinical methods of the times, "which allowed one to bring out of the Scripture text any meaning that the words could possibly be made to bear." That the New Testament writers were influenced by the age in which they lived, and that their mode of thought was governed in some degree by their education, must be admitted; but to say that they followed the rabbins into all their vagaries and put

\* QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Crawford Howell Toy. Pp. xliii., 321. 6¼x9%. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884. \$3.50.

into the Old Testament any meaning not intended by the Divine mind, is not only to ignore the facts, but also to deny that the apostles and evangelists were inspired in *any true sense* of the word. In all the treatment the human element is brought forward prominently while so far as any expression is given we might think that the divine element was wholly unrecognized by the author.

Where he comes to speak of Jesus' references to the Old Testament, he assumes a modest and reverential bearing, but in reality he deprives Christ's teaching of all authority and weight, for he makes the principles of modern hermeneutical science the ultimate standard of judgment, and thus convicts Christ himself of errors of interpretation. Much more correct to our mind is the position as laid down in *Briggs' Biblical Study*, p. 314: "Christ uses all that was appropriate in the rabbinical method; but never employs any of the casuistry or hair-splitting Halacha of the scribes. \* \* \* The rabbins interpreted the Scriptures to accord with the traditions of the elders; Jesus interpreted them to accord with the mind of God, their author."

In the body of the work, where the quotations are discussed, special pleading is frequently indulged in; the author seems to be trying to prove a point rather than to ascertain the facts (see pp. 73, 79, 175). The predictive element of the Old Testament is largely lost sight of, and the conclusions reached at times seem hardly the legitimate outcome from the facts presented.

The book gives evidence of hard study and the high critical scholarship for which Prof. Toy is so deservedly noted. The differences between the Hebrew, Septuagint and New Testament texts are pointed out with great clearness and exactness, and in this respect the book is highly to be commended. Its great and fatal errors, as we think and have already indicated, are (1) the pressing to the extreme of a theory, and (2) the entire ignoring of the divine agency.

The Greek and Hebrew type used in the book is indistinct, difficult to read; and there are few verses in which some error in accents, vowel-points, sh'vâs, or dāghēshes cannot be found.

At the close of the book are very complete and valuable indices of all the Old Testament passages cited in the New; from these we gather the following facts:

*Matthew* quotes Gen. 4 times, Exod. 12, Levit. 6, Num. 2, Deut. 18, Ps. 13, Prov. 2, Eccles. 1, Is. 15, Jer. 2, Dan. 6, Hos. 3, Joel, Micah and Malachi 1 each, Zech. 3; in all 90 quotations.

*Mark* quotes Gen. 4 times, Exod. 6, Lev. 1, Deut. 7, Ps. 6, Eccles. 1, Is. 7, Jer. 1, Dan. 6, Joel, Micah, Zechariah and Malachi 1 each; in all 43.

*Luke* quotes Gen. 1, Exod. 5, Lev. 2, Deut. 9, 1 Sam. 7, 2 Sam. 2, Ps. 13, Eccles. 1, Is. 15, Jer. 1, Dan. 6, Joel and Micah 1 each, Mal. 6; in all 70.

*John* quotes Gen. 4, Exod. 1, Num. 1, Deut. 1, 2 Sam. 1, Ps. 9, Prov. 1, Is. 7, Jer. 2, Ezek. 1, Micah 1, Zech. 2; in all, 31.

*Acts* quotes Gen. 16 times, Exod. 14, Deut. 6, Josh. 1, 1 Sam. 1, 2 Sam. 2, 1 Kings 1, Ps. 12, Is. 6, Joel and Hab. 1 each, Amos 2; in all 63.

*Romans* quotes Gen. 6, Exod. 6, Lev. 3, Deut. 9, 2 Sam. 1, 1 Kings 1, Job 1, Ps. 15, Prov. 5, Eccles. 1, Is. 20, Jer. 1, Hosea, Joel, Hab. and Mal. 1 each; in all 73.

*Hebrews* quotes Gen. 13, Exod. 6, Lev. 1, Num. 1, Deut. 6, 2 Sam. 1, Ps. 20, Prov. 2, Is. 2, Jer. 2, Hab. and Haggai 1 each; 56 in all.

*The Pentateuch* is quoted 216 times; Historical Books, 20; Poetical Books, 138; The Prophets, 141: Minor Prophets, 44; so in all, exclusive of the Revelation,

there are 559 quotations from the Old Testament. Of individual books Is. is quoted 106 times; Ps. 104, Deut. 70; Gen. 62, Exod. 61, and Prov. 24 times. These are the ones to which most frequent reference is made.

□ There are no proper quotations, it is said, in the Book of Revelation. The indices, however, give 265 Old Testament passages alluded to in that book and discussed in the body of the work, mostly from Is., Ps., Dan. and Ezek. The line is not clearly drawn between allusions and quotations, and the book apparently includes both classes, for certainly many passages classed as quotations are in reality but the merest allusions. Including the Revelation, however, there are in all 824 Old Testament passages quoted or alluded to in the New Testament.

#### STEARNS' SYLLABUS OF MESSIANIC PASSAGES.\*

In this admirably conceived, and excellently wrought out *brochure*, we have, in a tangible form, the whole subject of Messianic prophecy. The method adopted is, to our mind, the correct one. Abstract discussions, with scarcely an allusion to a particular prophecy, may do for those who have exhaustively studied the subject; but for teaching men what the Old Testament has to say about a coming Messiah, it is necessary to examine exegetically in their order the texts which are supposed to contain Messianic references. This is what Dr. Stearns has done. Having explained what he understands to be a *Messianic text*, and having given a General Division of these texts, he begins (1) with the Pentateuchal texts: (a) Gen. III., 14, 15; (b) Gen. IX., 25-27; (c) Gen. XII., 3; (d) Gen. XXVII., 27-29; (e) Gen. XLIX., 8-12; (f) Num. XXIV., 14-17; (g) Deut. XVIII., 15-19. Next come the Messianic passages in the Psalms, under which are treated Ps. II., CX., LXXII., XLV., XXII., XVI. Finally the Messianic passages in the Prophets are considered. The specific passages are here omitted for lack of space. The method of treatment includes (1) the best literature upon the subject; (2) brief exegetical notes; (3) the history of the interpretation to some extent. The gradual development of the Messianic ideas is clearly traced. Students will find in this little manual, the material with suggestions, for independent work on their part in the study of this most important feature of the Old Testament.

The standpoint of the author is conservative, yet liberal. There is to be noticed a strong, firm faith in the authenticity of Scripture. Dr. Stearns is not one whose interpretations are characterized by fancies, of either a spiritualizing or a rationalistic character. We understand that this pamphlet is intended chiefly for the use of his students. It is to be hoped that he will soon formally publish it.

#### BOOK OF ADAM AND EVE.†

This is a Christian work; perhaps of some pious Egyptian of the fifth or sixth century. The story is told in a simple, childish way. The author evidently believes all that he says, and shows an inclination to believe as much more as circum-

\* A SYLLABUS OF THE MESSIANIC PASSAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By O. S. Stearns. Pp. 79. Boston: *Perival P. Bartlett*, 105 Summer street.

† THE BOOK OF ADAM AND EVE, also called the Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan; a Book of the Early Eastern Church. Translated from the Ethiopic, with notes from the Kufale, Talmud, Midrash, and other Eastern works. By the Rev. C. C. Malan, D. D., Vicar of Broadwindsor. Pp. 255. London: *Williams & Norgate*.

stances might ask. The object is to "connect the first Adam with the coming of the second, Christ. 'Adam holds frequent intercourse with the 'Word of God,' who tells him of His coming in the flesh in order to save him; a promise Adam charges his children to remember and to hand down to their own children. Then, when dead, his body is embalmed, and laid in the Cave of Treasures, where he and Eve had spent their life; and is thence taken by Noah, with the gold, the incense and the myrrh brought from Eden, and laid in the ark; whence it is taken out by Melchizedec after the flood; and brought by him, together with Shem and an angel sent to show the way, to "the middle of the earth," to the hill 'cranium,' or Golgotha. There, the rock opens of its own accord to receive the body of Adam, and then closes in again. It is on the very spot on which the Saviour's cross was raised, when He was crucified." The history is divided into four Books, the *first* of which includes the whole life of Adam and Eve; the *second* gives the history of the patriarchs who lived before the Flood; the *third* gives the history of the building of the Ark, of the Flood, and of the history of the earth until the call of Abraham; the *fourth* gives a very brief history of patriarchs, judges and kings, from Abraham to Christ. As a specimen of what an Oriental writer can accomplish, when he sets himself to the task, this book is an excellent example. There is some benefit to be gained from its perusal.

---

#### THE PSALTER: A WITNESS TO THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF THE BIBLE.\*

We have here five lectures delivered on the Vedder Foundation, Rutgers College, in 1876. They are the results of scholarly study presented in a popular and interesting way. The design of the book is to show that the Psalms, viewed as to their subject, aims, spirit and teaching, in comparison with other sacred hymns, are clearly of divine origin.

The first lecture is introductory; the others present the doctrine of God; the doctrine of man; the Messiah and the future life, and the ethical teachings, as found in the Psalter. In each the prominent features in the conceptions of the Psalmists are clearly and forcibly set forth. The marked superiority of these conceptions is distinctly shown by comparison with similar representations in the sacred hymns and literature of other races. The lecturer, perhaps, seems hardly disposed to grant to other religions their full due. The book is scholarly, suggestive, and eminently religious in tone. It is a valuable contribution to Psalm-literature.

---

#### BEDOUIN TRIBES OF THE EUPHRATES.†

If one can accept as trustworthy Dean Stanley's picturesque and vivid description of Abraham as a nomad of the desert, he will in this book get a clearer and more detailed conception of the historical surroundings of the Patriarch's life than is to be found in any other work with which we are acquainted. The author, Lady Blunt, with her husband spent a winter in wandering in the desert with the

\* THE PSALTER: A Witness to the Divine Origin of the Bible. (Vedder Lectures, 1876) T. W. Chambers, D.D. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 1876.

† THE BEDOUIN TRIBES OF THE EUPHRATES. By Lady Anne Blunt. New York: Harper & Bros. 1 vol. 8¼x5¼, pp. 445. Price \$2.50.

Bedouin tribes whose haunts are in that vast region extending from the upper waters of the Euphrates to Arabia. They assumed their dress, their customs; they entered into their political world; they adopted the very life of these tribes, whose habits have suffered but little or no change since Abraham and his sister's son went forth to go into the land of Canaan. Besides all this the book is an entertaining account of life among a little known and very interesting people.

◀SEMITIC AND OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY.▶

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

- CHEYNE, REV. T. K., *The Book of Psalms*. Translated. New York: *D. Appleton & Co.*.....\$1.25
- NEWTON, REV. R. H., *The Book of the Beginnings*. A study of Genesis, with general suggestions as to methods of studying the O. T. New York: *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. 1884. 16mo.....\$1.00
- NEWTON, REV. R. H., *The Right and Wrong Use of the Bible*. New York: *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. 1884. 16mo.....75c.
- STEBBINS, GILES B., *Chapters from the Bible of the Ages*. Detroit: *Thorndike Nourse*. 1884. Pp. iii., 402. 6th ed.....\$1.50
- Current Discussions in Theology, II. By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Chicago: *F. H. Revell*. 16mo. Pp. 324.....\$1.50

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- Analysis of the Books of Joshua and Judges, prepared expressly for the Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations; also Genesis. 12mo. pp. 64. London: *Allman*. Each.....25c.
- WRIGHT, DR. W. A., *The Bible Word Book*. Second ed. Revised and enlarged. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 1884.....

RECENT ARTICLES.

- BRANDT, *Die assyrisch-babylonische Keilschrift-Literatur und das A. T. Deutsche Blätt.* ix., 3, '84. pp. 164-187.
- NAVILLE, E., *Egypt Exploration Fund*. Pithom-Heroopolis. Letter. *The Academy*, March 22, '84. p. 210.
- ODGERS, J. E., *Jeremiah and the Fall of Judah*. *Modern Review*, Apr. '84. pp. 209-237.
- FLEAY, F. G., *Position of Polytheism in the Historical Development of Religion*. *American Antiquarian*, March, '84. pp. 74-82.
- MILLER, O. D., *Late Discoveries in Cuneiform Inscriptions*. *Ibid.* pp. 115-118.
- GAST, PROF. F. A., *Assyrian Research and the Old Testament*. *The Reformed Quarterly Review*, Apr., '84. pp. 178-199.
- SCHODDE, Prof. GEO. H., *The Messianic Views of Christ's Contemporaries*. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Apr., 1884. pp. 261-284.
- BEECHER, HENRY WARD, *A Symposium on Evolution: Is the Darwinian Theory of Evolution Reconcilable with the Bible? If so, with what limitations? No. V.* *Homiletic Monthly*, May, '84. pp. 470-472.

- JOHNSON, FRANKLIN, D.D., The Curse Upon Nature. Genesis iii., 14-19. Romans viii., 19-23. *Baptist Quarterly Review*, Apr., '84. pp. 141-154.
- NEWMAN, A. H., LL. D., Biblical Theology—Its Nature, Presuppositions, Methods and Perils. *Baptist Quarterly Review*, Apr. '84. pp. 240-252.
- GREGORY, PRES. D. S., Key to Bible Unity. No. IV. *Pulpit Treasury*, May, '84. pp. 51, 52.
- PORTER, S. L., D. D., Light from the Orient on Bible Texts. The Phœnicians. *Pulpit Treasury*, May, '84. Pp. 71, 72.
- WARRING, C. B., PH. D., The Agreement of Science with Genesis I. *Journal of Christian Philosophy*, Jan., '84. pp. 173-195.
- CROSBY, HOWARD, D. D., The Site of Ebenezer. *Ibid.* pp. 230-232.
- DAWSON, PRIN. J. W., A Naturalist's Visit to Egypt. *Ibid.* pp. 278-290.
- TAYLOR, PROF. J. P., Archæological Notes. *Andover Review*, May '84, pp. 560-569.

## REVIEWS.

- TOY, DR. C. H., Quotations in the New Testament. By R. P. Stebbins, D. D. *Unitarian Review*, Apr., '84. pp. 380-383.
- WRIGHT, G. B., The Book of Job. By Russell Martineau. *Modern Review*, Apr., '84. pp. 388-390.
- An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. Vols. iii. and iv. By J. E. Carpenter. *Ibid.* pp. 380-394.
- DELITZSCH, DR. FRANZ, Biblischer Commentar über die Psalmen. By Nowack. *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, Apr. 5. pp. 163-'64.
- OEHLER, Old Testament Theology. *Ref. Quar. Rev.*, Apr. '84. pp. 270-272.